

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLII

MARCH, 1927

Number 3

A QUEEN AT CHESSE

Although in general Scott in *Kenilworth*, chapter 15, follows the story of Walter Raleigh's throwing his cloak upon the ground for Queen Elizabeth to walk on, as told by Fuller in his *Worthies of England*,¹ he makes to the tale as told there one notable addition. According to Scott, in a subsequent interview between Raleigh and the Queen, the latter rewards the young courtier as follows:

"And here," she added, giving him a jewel of gold, in the form of a chess-man, "I give thee this to wear at the collar."

What was Scott's source for this addition? A little investigation reveals the fact that the chess-man reward was in history made by the Queen to Sir Charles Blount. Scott has merely taken Blount's chess-man and awarded it to Raleigh, but there are two versions of the story extant, both written by contemporaries of Blount and Raleigh, both of which, there is evidence to indicate, Scott had read just before or during the composition of *Kenilworth*. The two versions are, moreover, so similar as to suggest some common origin, at present unknown.

The first version was written by Anthony Bacon, elder brother of Francis Bacon. Bacon was employed by Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex, as his foreign correspondent, or as Bacon put it, "under secretary of state for foreign affairs." Essex sneered at Blount for wearing the chess-man and Blount challenged, fought, wounded and disarmed him. Curiously, Francis Bacon, brother of the writer of this anecdote, lived to prosecute Essex, and Blount was one of the judges who condemned Sir

¹ *The History of the Worthies of England*, by Thomas Fuller, London, 1811, vol. II, p. 287.

Walter Raleigh in 1603. The date of the writing of the Bacon version is unknown except that it antedated Bacon's death in 1601, and it remained in manuscript until published in 1754. Its belated appearance then came in a work entitled:

Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, from the year 1581 until her death. In which the Secret Intrigues of her Court, and the conduct of her favourite, Robert Earl of Essex, both at Home and Abroad, are particularly illustrated. Fom the original papers of his intimate friend, Anthony Bacon, Esquire, and other manuscripts never before published. By Thomas Birch D. D., rector of the United Parishes of St. Margaret Pattens and St. Gabriel Fenchurch, and Secretary of the Royal Society.

Here it was printed in volume II, page 191, as follows:

His first appearance gave jealousy to the earl of Essex. For Sir Charles Blount, as he then was, having run one day very well at tilt, the queen was so highly pleased with him, that she sent him in token of her favour a queen at chess in gold, richly enameled, which his servants the next day fastened to his arm with a crimson ribband. The earl, as he passed through the privy chamber, espying this, and Sir Charles's cloak under his arm, the better to display it, inquired what it was, and for what cause there fixed? Mr. Fulk Greville answering, that it was the queen's favour, which the day before, after the tilting she had sent to Sir Charles Blount; the earl in a kind of emulation, and as though he would have limited her majesty's grace, said, "Now I perceive every fool must have a favour." This bitter and public affront coming to Sir Charles's ear, he sent his lordship a challenge, and they met near Marybone park, where the earl was wounded in the thigh, and disarm'd. The queen missing them was very curious to know the truth, which being at last told her, she swore by God's death that it was fit, that some one or other should take the earl down, and teach him better manners; otherwise there would be no rule with him. But this incident was the beginning of the friendship between the earl and Sir Charles, which the queen herself then established.

Four years later, in 1758, the story was republished, this time as a footnote, in Horace Walpole's *Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors*, to the account of Robert Devereux in that work. The paragraph to which the chess story was appended, follows:

His early marriage with the widow of Sir Philip Sidney, did not look as if he himself had any idea of her Majesty's inclination for him: perhaps he had learned from the example of his father-in-law, that her Majesty's passions never extended to matrimony. Yet before this he had insulted Sir Charles Blount, on a jealousy of the Queen's partiality. Instead of sentimental softness, the spirit of her father broke out on that occasion; she swore a round oath, "That unless someone or other took him down, there would be no ruling him."

Walpole acknowledged his source to be *Bacon Papers*, Vol. II, p. 191.

In 1787 Richard Twiss published anonymously his *Chess*, a volume described in its opening paragraph as a "Trifle offered to Chess-players, as a compilation of all the Anecdotes and Quotations that could be found relative to the Game of Chess." In this volume, page 25, the Bacon story once again appeared, and is this time credited to "Bacon's papers, as quoted by Mr. Walpole, in his Royal and Noble Authors of England."

In both Walpole and Twiss the story is much condensed and might as easily derive from the Naunton version (see below) as from the Bacon, but is in each case definitely credited to the Bacon Papers. Twiss varies from Walpole only in the addition of the name of the queen. As printed by Twiss the story is as follows:

Sir Charles Blount, afterwards Earl of Devonshire, a very comely young man, having distinguished himself at a tilt, her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, sent him a Chess-queen of gold enameled, which he tied upon his arm with a crimson ribband. Essex perceiving it, said with affected scorn, "Now I perceive every fool must have a favour!" On this, Sir Charles challenged, fought him in Marybone-park, disarmed, and wounded him in the thigh.

The other version of this story appeared first in Sir Robert Naunton's *Fragmenta Regalia*. Naunton had in Elizabeth's reign been a dependent of Walter Devereux, the first Earl of Essex. His death occurred in 1635 and his book was published posthumously in 1641. It was written, according to Prof. Edward Arber, in or about 1630. In this event the Naunton version of the chess story was the first into print, antedating the Bacon version in this respect by 113 years, but the Naunton version was not written until at least 29 years after the composition of the Bacon story.

The Naunton account, taken from the Arber reprint of the third edition (1653), of *Fragmenta Regalia*, is as follows:

My Lord Mountjoy (who was another child of her favour) being newly come to Court, and then but Sir Charles Blount (for my Lord William his elder brother was then living), had the good fortune one day to run very well a Tilt; and the Queen therewith was so well pleased, that she sent him in token of her favour, a Queen at Chesse of gold richly enameled, which his servants had the next day fastened on his Arme with a Crymson ribband; which my Lord of Essex, as he passed through the Privy Cham-

ber espying, with his cloak cast under his Arme, the better to commend it to the view, enquired what it was, and for what cause there fixed? Sir Foulk Grevil told him, that it was the Queens favour, which the day before, and after the Tilting she had sent him; whereat my Lord of Essex, in a kind of emulation, and as though he would have limited her favour, said, Now I perceive every fool must have a favour.

This bitter and publike affront came to Sir Charles Blunts eare, who sent him a challenge, which was accepted by my Lord, and they met near Mary-bone-park, where my Lord was hurt in the thigh and disarmed: the Queen missing the men, was very curious to learn the truth; and when at last it was whispered out she swore by Gods death, it was fit that some one or other should take him down, and teach him better manners, otherwise there would be no rule with him. And here I note the inition of my Lords friendship with Mountjoy, which the Queen her self did then conjure.

Scott had without much doubt read the Walpole condensation of the Bacon story, and the Naunton version just before he wrote *Kenilworth* or during its composition. In note C to *Kenilworth* he acknowledges his indebtedness to Naunton for information upon Sussex and Leicester. Indeed his description of Sussex in chapter 14 suggests that *Fragmenta Regalia* must have been open on the desk before him as he wrote. The second sentence of the third paragraph of this chapter begins:

Sussex was, according to the phrase of the times, a martialist; had done good service in Ireland. . . .

Naunton, in his description of Sussex says:

. . . he was indeed one of the Queens Martialists, and did very good service in Ireland. . . .

This was not Scott's first acquaintance with Naunton. In 1808 there had been published at Edinburgh a volume entitled:

Memoirs of Robert Cary; Earl of Monmouth. Written by himself. And *Fragmenta Regalia*, by Sir Robert Naunton. With explanatory annotations.

These annotations had been supplied by Scott.

On the other hand Scott had at just about this time been going over the work of Horace Walpole, as he included a life of Walpole to the *Novelist's Library* series. Scott began his work on this series of lives with that of Fielding, which, according to Lockhart he handed to Ballantyne in the autumn of 1820. Publication did not begin until February 1821. Lockhart is not clear as to

whether composition of these lives was completed before the first volume was published, or not, and publication continued into the summer of 1821, but in the list of published works printed in the appendix,² the *Lives of the Novelists* is made to precede *Kenilworth*. *Kenilworth* according to the same authority appeared in the week of Jan. 17, 1821.

Scott's reference to Walpole's *Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors* in his life of Walpole would suggest that he had at least glanced through its pages before pronouncing upon it. Had he done so at a time when *Kenilworth* was in mind it is hardly conceivable that he could have overlooked the Devereux-Blount story, emphasized by the footnote. Scott's criticism follows:

The . . . work evinces, in a particular degree, Mr. Walpole's respect for birth and rank; yet is, perhaps, ill calculated to gain much sympathy for either. It would be difficult, by any process or principle of subdivision, to select a list of as many plebian authors, containing so very few whose genius was worthy of commemoration.

That Scott had ever read the *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, by Birch, there seems to be no evidence, nor is there any of an acquaintance with the fascinating volume by Twiss. Scott had been a chess enthusiast in his invalid boyhood but abandoned the game later. "He used to say that it was a scheme to throw away upon mastering a mere game, however ingenious, the time which would suffice for the acquisition of a new language. 'Surely,' he said, 'chess-playing is a sad waste of brains.'"

The Naunton story and the original Bacon story are so nearly alike as to suggest a common origin, and are yet enough unlike to make it improbable that either is a mere copy of the other. Bacon's version seems certainly to have been written at least 29 years before the Naunton, yet Naunton may well have had access to the Bacon manuscript either before or after Bacon's death. Either might well have known of the incident, yet had each later written the story independently, there would have been no such similarity of phrasing.

HAROLD H. SCUDDER.

University of New Hampshire.

² *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.*, by John Gibson Lockhart. Boston, 1870.

DENIS SAURAT ON MILTON'S COLOR VISION

Appendix A of M. Denis Saurat's *Milton, Man and Thinker* (New York, The Dial Press, 1925) arguing "that Milton's blindness was due to retinitis, complicated perhaps by glaucomatous troubles developed from eyestrain as a result of a generally bad state of health, probably attributable to hereditary syphilis" (p. 338), contains a brief passage to the effect that Milton's "ability to see colors both precisely and at a distance tells strongly against the hypothesis of myopia, at least of a pernicious myopia sufficiently accentuated to lead ultimately to a detachment of the retina" (pp. 334-5).

It is not my wish to deal with the doubtful medical argument presented by M. Saurat, but only with the material and the method employed in support of his contention that Milton "saw the colors about him in a normal manner" (p. 334), and that he had the "ability to see colors both precisely and at a distance" (p. 334).

M. Saurat gives the matter scant attention. "Let us now attempt," he writes (pp. 333-4),

to arrive at plausible conclusions on the subject of the disease which brought about [Milton's] loss of sight. The important fact to start with, in our opinion, is Milton's perception of colors. In a useful article published in *Modern Language Notes* for December, 1894, Mr. V. P. Squires presents statistics which seem to us decisive on this point. Milton mentions in his works 29 different shades [*sic*] of color; he could, therefore, distinguish them. Of these 29 colors, those named most frequently are: gold, 47 times; green, 43 times; red and its varieties, 19 times; violet, 13 times; gray, 12 times; blue, 13 times; the other shades [*sic*] recur much less often. Now, these are the normal colors of nature: the gold of the sun, the red, gold, and violet of sunrise and sunset, the green of vegetation, the blue of the sky, the gray of somber days, of the earth, and of cities. Milton, therefore, saw the colors about him in a normal manner. He also saw colors at a distance; we need cite only a description of a sunset and moonrise, which, written at a time when literature made little of "picturesque" effects, is a sufficient proof:

. . . the sun now fall'n
Beneath the Azores; whether the prime orb
Incredible how swift, had thither roll'd
Diurnal, or this less voluble earth

By shorter flight to the east, had left him there
 Arraying with reflected purple and gold
 The clouds that on his western throne attend:
 Now came still evening on, and twilight gray
 Had in her sober livery all things clad;
 Silence accompanied, for beast and bird,
 They to their grassy couch, these to their nests
 Were slunk, all but the wakeful nightingale;
 She all night long her amorous descant sung;
 Silence was pleas'd: now glow'd the firmament
 With living sapphires; Hesperus, that led
 The starry host, rode brightest, till the moon,
 Rising in clouded majesty, at length
 Apparent queen, unveiled her peerless light,
 And o'er the dark her silver mantle threw.

(P. L. iv, 591-609.)

In the account of Mr. Squires are a few statistical errors which M. Saurat does not rectify. For example, *golden* (not *gold*) appears 49, not 47, times in the poetry of Milton (Bradshaw). In how many cases it is used as a color name, it is hard to determine, as Mr. Squires pointed out; M. Saurat makes no attempt to give an accurate count. Mr. Squires failed to observe the inconsistency of using *gray* as a color name, but not *black* and *white*. None of the three words refers to a color of the spectrum, although all are used popularly as referring to colors. Again, Mr. Squires did not consider the possibility that *purple* referred not to the color *violet* or (modern) *purple*, but to *crimson* (as in P. L. III, 364: "the bright Pavement . . . Impurpl'd with celestial roses"), or to mere *brilliance* (as in *Lycidas* 141: "And *purple* all the ground with vernal flowers").

Mr. Squires listed as separate color names all the modifications of *red* occurring in Milton's poems, although there is no real distinction in some cases. A *red* blush (Ps. VI, 22) and a *rosy red* blush (P. L. VIII, 619) seem to be the same. Furthermore, according to the N. E. D., *roseate*, listed by Mr. Squires as a color name, means *rose-scented* in P. L. v, 646.

Such points as these M. Saurat should not have overlooked in dealing with the list given by Mr. Squires. Still less should he have misquoted as he has, giving *gold* instead of *golden*, and *violet* instead of *purple*. Milton uses *gold* 51 times, apparently to

denote gloriousness rather than color; he does not use *violet* as a color name at all.

"The important fact to start with, in our opinion," says M. Saurat, "is Milton's perception of colors." Just why his opinion is such, he does not say, although the reader would be greatly enlightened by reasons, especially as the very article by Mr. Squires, quoted by M. Saurat, built up a very considerable argument that Milton *was* myopic. Mr. Squires did not start with Milton's perception of colors, but with his perception of many forms of life and manifestations of nature. Into his argument he brought his list of color names, as a rather minor part of the discussion. The main argument of Mr. Squires, showing that Milton did not see well, and was probably myopic, is ignored by M. Saurat, who seizes upon one of the least significant lists in the article, and proceeds to build on that foundation, giving it no critical examination, and insinuating that the opinion he arrives at is the gist of the "useful article" he quotes.

Next, M. Saurat indulges in some logic as strange as it is unsound. "Milton mentions in his works," he says, "29 different shades of color; he could, therefore, distinguish them." The course of reasoning implied by the *therefore* is faulty: more evidence than naming names must be adduced to prove that a man can distinguish among the things named. As a matter of fact, such a confusion of descriptive color names as shown by Milton when he refers to "thwarting thunder *blue*" in *Arcades* 51, and to "*red* lightning" in *P. L.* I, 175, leads one to question the accuracy of his power to distinguish colors.

M. Saurat goes on with another bit of faulty reasoning. "These," he says, "are the normal colors of nature: the gold of the sun, the red, gold, and violet of sunrise and sunset, the green of vegetation, the blue of the sky, the gray of somber days, of the earth, and of cities. Milton, therefore, saw the colors about him in a normal manner." Let us consider Milton's actual use of the colors mentioned by M. Saurat.

Milton does not refer to the "*gold* of the sun," although he once calls the sun *golden* (*P. L.* III, 572). Three times only does he refer to the *gold* of sunrise or sunset (*P. L.* IV, 596; V, 187; VI, 13). The sun in the *Nativity Ode* 130 rises "Curtain'd with cloudy *red*." Three times (*P. L.* V, 1; VI, 3; XI, 175) morn is

described by the adjective *rosy*, since the time of Homer the conventional epithet. Once *purple* (not *violet*) is used in connection with sunset (*P. L.* iv, 596).

To the "*green* of vegetation" Milton does refer many times; but, as Mr. Squires pointed out, he has no shades or tints of *green*. Such use of *green* unmodified shows no intimate acquaintance with nature, for he might have got his descriptions in great part from such a poet as Spenser. The "*blue* of the sky" Milton mentions but once (*P. L.* xi, 206); and he mentions "heaven's *azure*" once (*P. L.* i, 297).

The "*gray* of somber days" does not appear in Milton's poetry, nor does the *gray* "of cities." Once only the *gray* "of the earth" appears, in *L'Allegro* 71. However, the *grayness* of twilight is mentioned six times.

Milton's other uses of these "colors of nature" are entirely imaginative and literary. When we compare the actual number of times the colors mentioned by M. Saurat are used as he suggests, with the whole number of their appearances in Milton's poetry (using the count given by M. Saurat for the sake of simplicity), we find the ratio to be 57 : 147 (38.8%)—giving M. Saurat the benefit of such expressions as "heaven's *azure*" and "twilight *gray*." Without *green*, the ratio is 18 : 104 (17.3%)!

Consequently, M. Saurat's statement needs further proof; for as it stands it is merely this: Milton knew the names of colors that appear in nature, and therefore saw the colors themselves in a normal manner!

M. Saurat says, again, "He also saw colors at a distance," and cites the famous twilight passage from *P. L.* iv, 591-609 in support. Yet, although it may seem at first glance colorful, this passage has really only 4 color names in it: *purple*, *gold*, *gray*, *silver*. Of these, *gray* is in reality no spectral color; and *silver*, describing moonlight, would seem to connote the familiar colorless sheen of that illumination. As has been said, the color value of *gold* and *purple* is doubtful.

There are, however, 4 other words in the passage which suggest color or absence of color: *sapphires*, *sober*, *clouded*, *dark*. Of these, *sapphires* may denote blueness, although more probably it denotes merely brilliance and glory. Milton liked to use the names of precious stones to such purpose. (Cf. *P. L.* iii, 596-7; v, 634; vi,

Howard
Howard

756-8; *At A Solemn Music* 7.) Dr. Heinrich Mutschmann ingeniously suggests a literary origin for "living sapphires" in Milton's readings of Russian travel. (*Studies Concerning the Origin of "Paradise Lost,"* p. 22.)

The other 3 words show absence of color, mere degrees of darkness. In addition to them are 3 words of light and brightness, *glow'd, brightest, light*, equally unindicative of color.

The passage shows us, then, that Milton was aware of the gorgeousness of a sunset covering half the heavens, although not that *purple* and *gold* refer to the colors *violet* and *golden*, rather than to mere splendor. He was aware, also, of the brilliance of the stars, and the sheen of moonlight. But to argue that such a nyc-talopian passage shows that Milton saw colors "at a distance" is such questionable logic that one example, that of the rainbow, may refute it. In *P. L.* XI, 866 and 897, Milton refers to the rainbow as having three colors. In a note on l. 866, R. C. Browne states that Du Bartas gives the rainbow only three colors. In relying on Du Bartas, rather than on his own observation if he could distinguish colors at a distance, Milton shows a curious and perverse attachment to his books!

We see, in conclusion, that M. Saurat has failed to verify his source; he has misquoted his source; he has argued from his own notions of color names rather than from Milton's use of them; he has made no definite statistical consideration of color names, but has argued from generalities not well founded; and, omitting a contradictory example, he has quoted in support of his thesis a passage which really offers no support.

Carleton College.

S. A. Nock.

THE COMEDY *LINGUA* AND THE *FAERIE QUEENE*

Fleay alone among the scholars of the nineteenth century who have discussed T. Tomkis' play *Lingua* (1607) has contributed information as to the source of this play. According to Fleay, *Lingua* is "clearly founded on an Italian model."¹ He fails, how-

¹ Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, II, 261; *idem*, *Shakespeariana*, 1885, II, 121.

ever, to give any definite indication of such an original. Professor James Holly Hanford, in support of Fleay's statement, in 1913 announced that "a very probable ulterior source [of *Lingua*], which seems to have escaped the notice of those who have discussed the English play, is found in Giorgio Alione's *Comedia de L'Omo e de' soi Cinque Sentimenti*, written in the dialect of Asti and first published in 1521."² As Professor Hanford points out, the main resemblance between the two plays lies in the central idea of the plot, which is built around the aspirations of a part of the body to rise to the position of a sixth sense. There is much in *Lingua*, however, that finds no counterpart in the Italian comedy. It is much more elaborate, and introduces numerous characters not found in Alione's comedy.

The main action in *Lingua* is concerned with the civil strife in Microcosmus in which the five "exterior senses" are arrayed against Queen Psyche and her counselors, the three "interior senses." This main action of the English play, which is lacking in *L'Omo*, is based upon Canto IX of Book II of the *Faerie Queene*, with details borrowed from Cantos XI and XII of the same book.

The main characters of the allegory of the body in the *Faerie Queene* and in *Lingua* are the same. In the *Faerie Queene*, Alma (soul) is guided by the counsel of three wise sages, representing Imagination, Reason and Memory, the three interior senses. The names of the first and the third of Alma's counselors are Phantastes (imagination) and Eumnestes (memory). Alma's second counselor, personifying reason, is unnamed. In the defence of the Castle of Temperance (the body of man), Alma has the active assistance of Man's five exterior senses, Sight, Hearing, Touch, Smell and Taste. In *Lingua*, the same characters occupy a prominent part. Queen Psyche³ (soul) corresponds to Alma. She, as Alma, has three counselors typifying the three interior senses. Their names, which are either identical with the names, or sug-

² *The Debate Element in the Elizabethan Drama*, by James Holly Hanford, in *Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge*, 1913, 455.

³ Queen Psyche is included in the *dramatis personae* of the 1607 quarto edition of *Lingua* as among the "Personae, quarum mentio tantum fit." Although she does not appear as a character in the play, she is frequently mentioned: pp. 338, 371, 379, 394, 418, 425, 428 and 429.

gested by the natures, of the characters of Spenser's allegory, are Phantastes, Common Sense and Memory. By their assistance Psyche finally succeeds in quelling the civil disorders instituted by the Five Senses, that have in *Lingua* the Latin names, Visus, Auditus, Tactus, Olfactus and Gustus.

The allegories of the body in the two works differ mainly in the relation of the Five Senses in each to their respective rulers, Alma and Psyche. Whereas in the *Faerie Queene* the allegory tells of a victory of the *united* forces of the body, including the Five Senses, over evil forces that attack the body, in *Lingua* the allegory presents the Five Senses plotting strife among themselves to the injury of the body. In other words, the Castle of Temperance in the *Faerie Queene* becomes in *Lingua* a Castle of Intemperance, in which the revolt of the Five Senses plotted by *Lingua* furnishes the major part of the action of the comedy.

A comparison of passages in the *Faerie Queene* with derived passages in *Lingua* will make clearer the influence of the one work upon the other and show how closely Tomkis followed at times his source.

The prototypes of Psyche's three counselors⁴ in *Lingua* are the "three honourable sages" in the *Faerie Queene*, that in "three rowmes did sondry dwell" (the head) of Alma's castle (the body of man). Spenser introduces them as follows:⁵

These three in these three rowmes did sondry dwell,
And counselled faire Alma, how to governe well.
The first of them could things to come foresee;
The next could of thinges present best advise;
The third things past could keepe in memorie:
So that no time nor reason could arize,
But that the same could one of these comprice.

These three characters, typifying among them, in Hamlet's words, "that capability" of "looking before and after" and "god-like reason," are introduced in *Lingua* in the same order as they are found in the *Faerie Queene*, in three successive comic scenes, Act II, Scenes II, III, IV, which contain a number of de-

⁴ The relation to Queen Psyche in Tomkis' play of the three counselors is described in I, i, in the Hazlitt's *Dodsley* edition of *Lingua*, vol. ix, p. 338. Other references to *Lingua* are to this edition.

⁵ *Faerie Queene*, II, ix, 48, 8-9, and 49, 1-5.

scriptive details supplied by Spenser. An instance of the manner in which Tomkis employed in these three scenes, and elsewhere, Spenser's descriptive details is found in his description of Spenser's character "that hight Phantastes by his nature trew." In the *Faerie Queene* Phantastes is described as,⁶

A man of yeares yet fresh, as mote appere,
Of swarth complexion, and of crabbed hew,
That him full of melancholy did shew;
Bent hollow beetle browes, sharpe staring eyes,
That mad or foolish seemd:

In *Lingua*, Phantastes (the name is the same in both instances) is introduced in a descriptive stage direction as "a swart-complexioned fellow, but quick-eyed."⁷ Later Heuresis, Phantastes' page, in a description of his master, repeats the same and other details of Spenser's description of Phantastes.⁸

Another instance in which Spenser has furnished Tomkis with a descriptive detail is found in his account of Eumnestes, "all decrepit in his feeble corse:"⁹

The warres he well remembred of King Nine,
Of old Assaracus, and Inarchus divine.

In *Lingua*,¹⁰ Memory, "an old decrepit man," can also "remember, in the age of Assaracus and Ninus, and about the wars of Thebes and the siege of Troy."

An equally clear example of Tomkis' indebtedness is connected with that part of Spenser's description of Eumnestes which refers to his page, Anamnestes (reminder), "a litle boy" who "did on him still attend,"¹¹

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, ix, 52, 3-7.

⁷ *Lingua*, p. 367 (II, ii). Compare also the last speech of Phantastes on p. 370, and the same character's speech on pp. 401-402, with *Faerie Queene*, II, ix, 50, for similar borrowing of ideas.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 389 (III, iii): "O yes! If any man can tell any tidings of a spruce, neat, apish, nimble, fine, foolish, absurd, humorous, conceited, fantastic gallant, with hollow eyes, sharp look, swart complexion, meagre face, wearing as many toys in his apparel as fooleries in his looks and gesture, let him come forth and certify me thereof, and he shall have for his reward—"

⁹ *Faerie Queene*, II, ix, 58, 8-9.

¹⁰ *Lingua*, p. 374 (II, iv).

¹¹ *Faerie Queene*, II, ix, 58, 5-9.

To reach, when ever he for ought did send;
 And oft when thinges were lost, or laid amis,
 That boy them sought and unto him did lend:
 Therefore he Anamnestes cleped is,
 And that old man Eumnestes, by their propertis.

In *Lingua*, Memory's page of the same name, Anamnestes, has the similar task of waiting on his master and of finding misplaced or lost articles. In the scene in which we are introduced to Memory and Anamnestes, Act II, Scene iv, the latter is sent by his master to look for his lost purse.

A passage in *Lingua*, which has not only verbal but also allegorical resemblance to a passage in the *Faerie Queene*, occurs in Gustus' description of his house (the mouth), which was placed, "not much unlike a cave," "near to the lowly base of Cephalon" (the head). This house is described in *Lingua* as "arch'd above by wondrous workmanship,"¹²

With heven stones wrought smoother and more fine
 Than jet or marble fair from Iceland brought.
 Over the door directly doth incline
 A fair percullis of compacture strong.

The corresponding passage in the *Faerie Queene* occurs in the description of the gate into Alma's castle "by which all in did pass" (the mouth):¹³

Of heven stone the porch was fayrely wrought
 Stone more of valew, and more smooth and fine,
 Then jett or marble far from Ireland brought;

.

And over it a fayre portoullis hong,
 Which to the gate directly did incline,
 With comely compasse and compacture strong.

Tomkis' debt to Book II of the *Faerie Queene* is not limited to Canto ix, but extends to Cantos xi and xii as well. Spenser's account in Canto xi¹⁴ of Maleger's attack upon the Five Senses defending the bulwarks of Alma's castle is alluded to directly in *Lingua*. This allusion occurs in *Lingua* in a speech

¹² *Lingua*, p. 424 (IV, v).

¹³ *Faerie Queene*, II, ix, 24, 1-3, 6-8.

¹⁴ *Faerie Queene*, II, xi, 5 to 15 especially.

of Mendacio's concerning the coming hostility among the angry Senses, in which Mendacio misreports in characteristic manner the outcome of Maleger's attack upon Alma's castle. In spite of the jumble of fact and fiction in Mendacio's account, the allusion is clear:¹⁵

I long to see those hotspur Senses at it: they say they have gallant preparations, and not unlikely, for most of the soldiers are ready in arms, since the last field fought against their yearly enemy Meleager and his wife Acrasia; that conquest hath so fleshed them, that no peace can hold them. But had not Meleager been sick, and Acrasia drunk, the Senses might have whistled for the victory.

The same account furnishes *Lingua*, further, in Mendacio's description of the forces gathered by the Senses, with the symbolic animals, insects and birds typifying the enemies of the different senses. Maleger's forces are divided into five troops, each troop being composed of creatures symbolizing the vices of the particular Sense whose bulwark it is to attack.¹⁶ In *Lingua*, similar personifications of the vices of the senses make up the troops of the Five Senses preparing for battle.¹⁷ As an example, Maleger's fifth troop, designed to assault the bulwark of Touch, suggested in *Lingua* the symbolic creatures in Tactus' army. Maleger's "fift troupe" is made up "of fowle misshapen wightes," in the forms of "snailes" "spyders" and "ugly urchins."¹⁸ Similarly in *Lingua*, Tactus is "strongly mann'd with three thousand bristled urchens," "four hundred tortoises," "besides a monstrous troop of ugly spiders."¹⁹ In the same way the "houndes," "apes" and "puttockes" in Spenser's account of the enemies of Smell²⁰ become in *Lingua*, in Mendacio's report of the troops of Olfactus, "great swine," "hounds and hungry mastiffs," and "vultures."²¹

¹⁵ *Lingua*, p. 361 (II, 1). There is also in *Lingua*, p. 338 (I, 1), an allusion to Una in the *Faerie Queene*: "Tis plain indeed, for truth no descant needs; Una's her name, she cannot be divided."

¹⁶ *Faerie Queene*, II, xi, 8-13.

¹⁷ *Lingua*, pp. 379-382 (II, v).

¹⁸ *Faerie Queene*, II, xi, 13, 3-9.

¹⁹ *Lingua*, p. 380 (II, v).

²⁰ *Faerie Queene* II, xi, 11.

²¹ *Lingua*, p. 382 (II, v). There are other less striking resemblances of the same kind between the creatures making up the troops of Visus, Auditus and Gustus in *Lingua*, and those forming the three troops in the

In the fifth act of the play, a new intrigue of *Lingua's* brings the Senses into a second disorder by means of a bottle of wine obtained of the enemy of temperance, "an old witch called Acrasia,"²² a character imported into this play from Canto XII of Book II of the *Faerie Queene*. Upon the discovery of *Lingua's* part in bringing about this second disorder of the Senses, Common Sense commits her "to close prison in Gustus's house," and charges Gustus "to keep her under the custody of two strong doors . . . till she come to eighty years of age." Gustus is to see, also, that "she be well-guarded with thirty tall watchmen, without whose license she shall by no means wag abroad."²³ The "thirty tall watchmen" (the teeth), who are to guard *Lingua* in "the close prison of Gustus's house," are derived from Spenser's allegorical description of the entrance of Alma's castle, where "rownd about the porch on every syde,"²⁴

Twise sixteene warders satt, all armed bright
In glistering steele, and strongly fortifyde:
Tall yeomen seemed they, and of great might,
And were enraunged ready still for fight.

Another Spenserian echo in *Lingua* owes much of its beauty to a famous passage in Canto XII of Book II. It occurs in a speech of *Auditus*' praising the sense of hearing, and is to be traced to Spenser's description of the music heard issuing from Acrasia's Bower of Bliss. The passage in *Lingua* is as follows:²⁵

May it please your lordship to withdraw yourself
Unto this neighbouring grove: there shall you see
How the sweet treble of the chirping birds,
And the soft stirring of the moved leaves,

Faerie Queene which Maleger had gathered to attack the bulwarks of Sight, Hearing and Taste.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 433 (V, 1). Acrasia, like Psyche, is only referred to in *Lingua*.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 461 (V, XIX).

²⁴ *Faerie Queene*, II, IX, 26, 2-5.

²⁵ *Lingua*, pp. 409-410 (III, VII). The only reference that I have found suggesting the influence of the *Faerie Queene* upon *Lingua* is contained in Collier's comment upon this passage, found in Hazlitt's *Dodsley* edition of *Lingua*, vol. IX, p. 409, note 3: "The author certainly in writing this beautiful passage had Spenser (*Faerie Queene*, b. II, c. 12) in his mind."

Running delightful descant to the sound
Of the base murmuring of the bubbling brook,
Becomes a concert of good instruments;
While twenty babbling echoes round about,
Out of the stony concave of their mouths,
Restore the vanished music of each close,
And fill your ears full with redoubled pleasure.

The lines in the *Faerie Queene* to which these beautiful lines are indebted are found in Book II, Canto XII, Stanza 71:

The joyous birdes, shrouded in chearefull shade,
Their notes unto the voice attempted sweet:
Th' angelicall soft trembling voyces made
To th' instruments divine response meet:
The silver sounding instruments did meet
With the base murmure of the waters fall:
The waters fall with difference discreet,
Now soft, now loud, unto the wind did call:
The gentle warbling wind low answered to all.

We are now in a position to estimate the extent to which *L'Omo* and the *Faerie Queene* have influenced the plot of *Lingua*. *Lingua* as we have seen, is indebted to *L'Omo* (whether directly or indirectly) for its central theme, the endeavor of *Lingua* to "have both name and power" of a sixth sense. After the first scene, in which this central theme is introduced to motivate what follows, we are chiefly concerned with the results of *Lingua's* "subtle policies" involving the revolts of the Senses. These disorders of the Senses are built upon the allegory of the body as it is found in the *Faerie Queene*, but not in *L'Omo*, and form the main action of *Lingua*. The influence of the *Faerie Queene*, therefore, outweighs the influence of Alione's comedy. In contrast with *L'Omo*, "a very probable ulterior source" of Tomkis' work, the *Faerie Queene* is the immediate source, influencing the allegory, the plot, the characters, and the phrasing of *Lingua*.

M. P. TILLEY.

University of Michigan.

A NEW POE POEM

It is quite generally known that Poe was deeply indebted in his early literary career to John Neal, of Portland, poet, novelist, and editor in 1828 and 1829 of the *Yankee and Boston Literary Gazette*. In his earliest preserved letter, quoted in the *Yankee* for December, 1829, Poe makes the statement that Neal had given him "the very first words of encouragement that I ever remember to have heard." These words of encouragement, used by Neal, in September, 1829, in an otherwise rather caustic editorial comment on a poem called "Heaven" which Poe had submitted for publication in the *Yankee*, were "he might make a beautiful and perhaps a magnificent poem." This is the first thoroughly authenticated relationship between the two men. In the December *Yankee* Neal reviewed favorably Poe's contribution "Unpublished Poetry," comprising selections from the volume about to be published at Baltimore, *Al Aaraaf, Tamerlane, and Minor Poems*. In his gratitude, Poe dedicated "Tamerlane" in the new volume to Neal, and there is later evidence of their continued friendship. It is further contended by Harrison and other Poe scholars that two poems signed "P" which appeared in the *Yankee* for August and December of this same year, 1829,—*"The Skeleton-Hand"* and *"The Magician,"* respectively—were probably the work of Poe.

Why Poe, living in Baltimore in the summer of 1829, should have chosen Neal's comparatively obscure paper, published in Boston but edited at Portland, as almost the sole recipient of his early poetic endeavors, especially in view of Neal's caustic treatment of fledgling poets, has remained one of the numerous mysteries in his biography—a mystery which I think I have now solved. I believe that a poem of Poe's had already found publication in the columns of the *Yankee* over a year previously, before Neal had ever heard of the youthful poet. That this poem had been printed without any adverse comment—an unusual compliment from the editor of the *Yankee*—sufficiently accounts, if it is Poe's, for his later recourse to the paper.

The poem in question occurs on page 72 of the first volume—in the issue for February 26, 1828—and runs as follows:

THE THREE MEETINGS

To EVA

When first we met, thy cheek was fair,
For love's own rose was blooming there,
And in its varying hues revealing,
A soul of deep and chastened feeling.
The thought was full of agony
That such a being e'er could *die*.

We met again in after years,
Those eyes of love were dim with tears,
That cheek was pale—for pain and care
Had blighted every rosebud there;
Alas! 'twas deepest misery now,
To gaze upon that altered brow.

Ah! with my soul is lingering yet,
The madd'ning thought when *last* we met;
'Twas in thy shroud, thou dearest maid,
I saw that form beloved laid;
I press'd thy lips: ah God! the chill
Is present to my memory still;
Thy spirit pure had sought above,
Its home in a Redeemer's love.

Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1828.

EDGAR

My reasons for assigning the poem to Poe, besides consideration of his well-known later indebtedness to the *Yankee*, are the signature used, "Edgar," one he occasionally used elsewhere,¹ and the internal evidence, which seems to me strong everywhere except in the last two lines. Their clash with the rest of the poem helps to confirm me in my opinion, for I cannot believe that the author of this poem, whether or not he were Poe, could be guilty of such desecration. The theme of the poem is the wasting away of youthful beauty, and its natural culmination is in the shudder that death occasions. To append here the conventional balm for the blight of death is, artistically, to cause an unpardonable obtrusion. The author of the poem must certainly have known better.

Then, too, these last two lines not only pervert the spirit of the work; they destroy its symmetry. They are not only banal;

¹ *The Complete Poems of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. J. H. Whitty, 1911, pp. 275 and 284.

they are redundant. Without them the poem is composed of three similar stanzas.

Furthermore, these lines are not, in themselves, of the same poetic quality as the rest of the poem. The combination of sibilant and explosive consonants in the first is distinctly discordant, and the second foot of the other is unpleasantly weak.

Altogether, because they contradict the rest of the poem, because they destroy its symmetry, and because they are not so good poetry, I find it impossible to think that these two lines are a part of the original work.

Now according to Poe's biographers, he could not possibly have been in Cambridge on February 19, 1828, the address and date of the poem: the battery in which he was enlisted as Edgar A. Perry was ordered to Charleston, South Carolina, on October 31, 1827, and he did not come north again for over two years. It is clear that he could not have sent the poem directly to Neal. Dr. H. M. Ellis of the University of Maine has suggested that Poe either left it with a friend, or sent it to such a friend, in Cambridge, whence it somehow, after the friend had performed a blacksmith's repair job upon it, found its way to the *Yankee*, perhaps at Poe's request; and its favorable reception probably influenced Poe to try Neal again in September, 1829.

This hypothesis seems the most probable one; for it scarcely seems credible that Neal himself appended the two objectionable verses, as he was apparently not in the habit of altering manuscripts submitted to him without noting such alterations. He frequently changed them, but he gave notice of these changes so regularly that we must think it his common practice to do so.

The poem itself, except those two ruinous lines, shows strong traces of the peculiar genius that later animated such craftsmanship as has moved its pencil under but one name, and has known no peers in America. The theme is Poe's avowed choice—death and a beautiful woman; and its treatment reflects that melancholy view of life which was never absent from his work. There is here evidence of that dreaming faculty, of that interest in emotion as the value to be found in beauty, which Mr. George Woodberry has pronounced a primary element in Poe's genius, as original in

poetry as was Blake's conception in art—² a mingling of beauty with a vague and infinite horror that is felt rather than revealed. The subtitle addressing the poem to a particular woman, whose given name at least we do not here have to guess, scarcely needs to be pointed out as characteristic of Poe. The meter, iambic tetrameter, was a very common one with him, particularly in his early work. The stanza-form he used at least once, in "The Lake," among his early poems. The rich effect of the feminine rhyme in the third and fourth lines was a predilection which grew upon Poe, and the false rhyme of lines five and six can be duplicated over and over again in his work. We know that he frequently made rather radical use of mechanic devices like the italics of lines six and fourteen to secure precise elocutionary effects. But perhaps it is the intangible elements of poetry, the peculiar verse overtones, the harmony that appeals to the inner ear, that suggest Poe most.

I know of no way to prove it his; it has been too long overlooked for one to do that without the special favor of fortune. But because it occurs in a place where he later took special pains to seek publication; because it is signed with his given name;³ and because, all except two lines which are very much out of place and destructive of its symmetry—lines which actually deform it,—it is his theme treated in his manner, I believe the poem Poe's.

It may be objected that Poe never in any way lays claim to this poem. In his meticulous collection of Poe's poetry,⁴ after discarding poems elsewhere assigned to Poe, Mr. Killis Campbell publishes as "Uncollected Verses" and as "Poems Attributed to Poe" fifteen of the pieces commonly ascribed to him by such good authorities as George E. Woodberry, J. A. Harrison, and J. H. Whitty; some of these pieces are definitely known to be Poe's, and others of them are almost certainly his;—yet he referred to none of them in his letters. It seems practically certain that

² *Edgar Allan Poe*, George E. Woodberry: American Men of Letters Series, 1885, pp. 34-38.

³ The use of only the given name supports the foregoing hypothesis; for it was in general, as would be expected, poems sent to intimate friends that Poe signed thus.

⁴ *The Poems of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. Killis Campbell, Ginn and Company, 1917.

he, who revised his verse with painful minuteness, like most others, wrote many things to which he later made no claim, and which he probably wished to forget, as might well be true of this piece in its turgid entirety.

IRVING T. RICHARDS.

University of Maine.

LE DISSIPATEUR AND TIMON OF ATHENS

In his preface to *Le Dissipateur*¹ Destouches claims for his play complete originality. "Je n'ai travaillé sur aucun modèle," he says, "j'ai fait choix de mon sujet, j'en ai formé le plan et c'est la nature qui me l'a fourni." Nevertheless source-hunters, especially those of some fifty years ago, such as Moland, Wetz and Lenient, have not hesitated to point out resemblances between *Le Dissipateur* and Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* and to assert, in the vague and light-hearted way of the days when comparative literature was still in its infancy, that Destouches's play was a direct imitation of Shakespeare's.² Mr. Jusserand alone, to my knowledge, rejected this theory. He remarks: "Petitot thought (but wrongly) that he had discovered an imitation of 'Timon' in 'Le Dissipateur' of Destouches."³ A detailed comparison of *Le Dissipateur* with Shakespeare's *Timon* leads one to agree with Mr. Jusserand and to wonder not a little at the ready acceptance by other critics of *Timon* as the model of *Le Dissipateur*. The resemblances—save for the episode of the desertion of both Timon and Cléon by their friends—are of the most general kind and seem in no way to justify the categoric assertion of a direct imitation.

The most recent biographer and critic of Destouches, Mr. Jean

¹ *Le Dissipateur, ou l'Honneste-friponne*, comédie, Paris, Prault père, 1736. It was performed in the provinces in 1736, but had little success and was not produced in Paris until 1753.

² *Théâtre de Destouches*, avec une introduction par M. Louis Moland, Paris, 1878, p. xix; W. Wetz, *Die Anfänge der ersten bürgerlichen Dichtung des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, I. Band, Worms, 1885, p. 170; C. Lenient, *La Comédie au XVIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1888, I, p. 199.

³ J. Jusserand, *Shakespeare in France under the Ancien Régime*, London, 1899, p. 238, n. 3.

Hankiss, feels that his predecessors have gone too far in their statements and his conclusion on the matter is: "Je ne sais non plus si le *Dissipateur* relève de 'Timon.'" ⁴ He does however suggest, without examining in detail, two possible ways by which Destouches might have known *Timon*: "'Timon le Misanthrope' a été joué par les Italiens à plusieurs reprises; d'autre part, on a représenté à Londres la pièce de Shakespeare remanié par Shadwell" (here Mr. Hankiss quotes in a note from the account of this version given by Genest ⁵: "Shadwell introduces two ladies . . . he has spoilt the character of Flavius."), de sorte que le sujet a pu être connu à Destouches sans qu'il se fût rendu compte d'avoir sous les yeux un ouvrage de Shakespeare." ⁶ Both these versions were apparently known to Mr. Hankiss only indirectly, and an examination of the texts casts a great deal of light on the question.

The *Timon le Misanthrope* of Delisle de la Drevetière ⁷ was first performed on January 2, 1722, while Destouches was still in England. However it is not impossible that he saw it, or at least heard it spoken of later, as it had a great success and a long run. It was certainly derived, not from Shakespeare, but either directly from Lucian's dialogue, *Timon the Man-hater* ⁸ or from an earlier French play by Brécourt, ⁹ derived in its turn from Lucian. The play is a curious mixture of philosophical dialogue and harlequinade and presents only one possible point of contact with the *Dissipateur*; the introduction of a female character into the story. But the plots and characters are so completely different that one must conclude that if Destouches did know this *Timon*, it certainly was not in his mind when he wrote the *Dissipateur*.

Mr. Hankiss' other suggestion is that Destouches might have known *Timon* through Shadwell's version of it, played in London.

⁴ Jean Hankiss, *Philippe Néricault Destouches, l'homme et l'oeuvre*, Debreczen, 1920, p. 271.

⁵ [John Genest] *Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*, Bath, 1832, 10 vols.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 188.

⁷ Paris, 1722.

⁸ Translations of Lucian had been published in France in 1582, 1613, 1654, 1674, 1685 and 1707. Shakespeare's *Timon* was based on Plutarch and on an earlier English play derived in its turn from Lucian. It is doubtful whether Shakespeare knew Lucian's dialogue directly.

⁹ *Timon*, comédie en un acte, en vers, par Brécourt, 1684.

This version was first produced in 1678, with Betterton in the title rôle, and from then until the middle of the eighteenth century it completely supplanted the original on the stage.¹⁰ Destouches was in London for six years, from 1717 to 1723, and during that time Shadwell's *Timon* was played at least five times at Drury Lane,¹¹ so that Destouches may very probably have seen *Timon* performed in Shadwell's version, but not in Shakespeare's. Shadwell, in the dedication of *Timon of Athens* or *the Man-Hater*,¹² says that his version "has the inimitable hand of Shakespeare in it, which never made more masterly strokes than in this. Yet I can truly say, I have made it into a play."¹³ This Shadwell accomplishes by introducing two important female characters (in Shakespeare's *Timon* the only female characters are the mistresses of Alcibiades, who play a very small part). Melissa, a coquette, is betrothed to Timon, and at the end of the first act his mistress, Evandra, appears and reproaches him bitterly for deserting her. In the next act Timon's feast is given for Melissa, and Evandra appears disguised in the mask of ladies and reproaches Timon further. In Act III, Melissa rejects Timon after the loss of his fortune and turns to Alcibiades. Evandra consoles Timon and in Act IV follows him to the woods to offer him her fortune, but finds him digging gold. On hearing the rumor of this, Melissa and her confidante, Chloe, arrive, but are rebuffed by Timon. After Timon's death, Evandra stabs herself and Alcibiades repulses Melissa's advances. These two characters certainly correspond to the Julie and Cidalise of Destouches. Julie is loving and faithful to Cléon as Evandra is to Timon; and Cidalise, fickle like Melissa, rejects Cléon in his distress. Moreover, the character

¹⁰ So much so that La Place, in his translation of Shakespeare which forms the first four volumes of the *Théâtre anglais* (1745), translates from Shadwell and not from Shakespeare.

¹¹ October 11, 1717; November 24, 1719; December 8, 1720; October 10, 1721; May 20, 1723. (Genest, *op. cit.*, vol. I.)

¹² Bankside Restoration Shakespeare. *The Life of Timon of Athens* (the text of the Folio of 1623, with that as made into a play by Thomas Shadwell in 1678), edited by Willis Vickery, New York Shakespeare Society, 1907).

¹³ Genest comments: "Some Frenchified definition of a play seems to have prevailed at this time, and for many years after." (*Op. cit.*, I, 250.)

of Timon in Shadwell's version is much closer to Cléon than is Shakespeare's *Timon*. The latter is a noble and extravagantly generous gentleman, loved by all, while Shadwell's Timon, like Cléon, is a rash and careless spendthrift. A close parallel between the two plays is manifestly impossible; one can say that *Le Dissipateur* borrowed from *Timon*, but not that it is an imitation of it. Certain figures, certain incidents are alike, but the plays are fundamentally different in conception. *Timon* is the tragedy of the man-hater; *Le Dissipateur* is the comedy of the spendthrift. But such borrowings as there are were very evidently made not from the *Timon* of the First Folio, but from *Timon* "made into a play" by Shadwell.

MARGARET GILMAN.

Bryn Mawr College.

GOLDSMITH'S SUPPOSED ATTACK ON FIELDING

In Mr. Blanchard's recent study of Fielding¹ the question is again raised for which of his contemporaries Goldsmith intended the attack on romances, contained in Letter LXXXIII of the *Citizen of the World*. After reviewing the claims of Richardson and Smollett to this dubious honor, Mr. Blanchard concludes, "If any single author was glanced at, it was probably Fielding."

Goldsmith could not have intended this passage as an attack on any of his contemporaries, since he did not write it. The entire essay, with the exception of the introductory passage, is an almost verbatim borrowing from *A Description of the Empire of China and Chinese-Tartary*, etc., translated from the French of P. J. B. Du Halde, and published in London by Edward Cave, in 1738-41, in two volumes folio. Goldsmith himself acknowledged the borrowing, by a foot-note giving the exact, and correct, page references² and by enclosing the borrowed portions in quotation marks. Although all the modern editors, with the exception of Knight,³ retain the foot-note and the quotation marks, they have cast

¹ *Fielding the Novelist*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1926, p. 150.

² II, 47 and 58. He also uses selections from pp. 48 and 61.

³ Knight encloses the first five paragraphs in quotations, and omits them from the remainder.

doubts on their veracity, even Gibbs, Goldsmith's most careful annotator, suspecting that the passage under consideration was really from Goldsmith's own pen, and was intended as a glance at Richardson.⁴ An examination of Goldsmith's source settles the doubt. The two versions of the passage under consideration are here given in parallel columns, to show Goldsmith's close dependence on Du Halde:

DU HALDE.

It was a saying of the Antients that a Man never opens a book without reaping some Advantage by it: I say with them, that every book can help to make me more expert, except Romances, and these debauch me. They are dangerous Fictions, where love is the ruling Passion. The most indecent strokes pass there for turns of Wit; and Intrigue and criminal Liberties for Politeness and Galantry; secret Appointments, and even Villainy itself are put in such Lights as may inspire the strongest Passion. There may be danger in them to Men who are come to Years, and who are of the strictest Probity. How much then ought young men to dread them, whose reason is weak, and whose Hearts are so susceptible of Passion! Can they swallow this Poison without being mortally infected.

To slip in by a private Passage, to leap a Wall cleverly, are Accomplishments that, when handsomely set off, enchant a young Heart. It is true, the Plot is commonly wound up by a Marriage, concluded with

GOLDSMITH.

It was a saying of the ancients, that a man never opens a book without reaping some advantage by it. I say with them, that every book can serve to make us more expert, except romances, and these are no better than instruments of debauchery. They are dangerous fictions, where love is the ruling passion.

The most indecent strokes there pass for turns of wit; intrigue and criminal liberties for gallantry and politeness. Assignations, and even villainy, are put in such strong lights, as may inspire even grown men with the strongest passion; how much more, therefore, ought the youth of either sex to dread them, whose reason is so weak, and whose hearts are so susceptible of passion?

To slip in by a back-door, or leap a wall, are accomplishments that, when handsomely set off, enchant a young heart. It is true, the plot is commonly wound up by a marriage, concluded with the consent

⁴ The confusion may have resulted from the fact that another translation, published in four volumes octavo, by J. Watts, in 1736, omits all the portions borrowed by Goldsmith for this essay. If this edition were used for verification the conclusion might naturally have been drawn that the professed borrowing was a literary subterfuge.

Consent of the Parents, according to the Rites that are prescribed. But as in the Body of the Work, there are many Passages that offend good Morals, overthrow the laudable Customs, violate the Laws, and destroy the most essential Duties among Men, Virtue is thereby exposed to the most dangerous attacks.

But, say some, the Authors of these Romances have nothing in view, but to represent Vice punished, and Virtue rewarded. I grant this; but will the greater number of readers take Notice of these Punishments and Rewards? Is not their Mind carried to some thing else? Can it be imagined that the Art with which the Author inspires the Love of Virtue, can overcome that Crowd of thoughts which sway them to Licentiousness? In order to treat the subject in such a Way, that all which precedes the Moral may be no more than an ingenious Artifice, for conveying it to the Mind in a more agreeable manner, the author ought to be a Philosopher of the first Rank. But in our Age where can we find Philosophers of so exalted a virtue.

of parents, and adjusted by every ceremony prescribed by law. But, as in the body of the work, there are many passages that offend good morals, overthrow laudable customs, violate the laws, and destroy the duties most essential to society, virtue is thereby exposed to the most dangerous attacks.

But, say some, the authors of these romances have nothing in view, but to represent vice punished, and virtue rewarded. Granted. But will the greater number of readers take notice of these punishments and rewards? Are not their minds carried to something else? Can it be imagined that the art with which the author inspires the love of virtue, can overcome that crowd of thoughts which sway them to licentiousness? To be able to inculcate virtue by so leaky a vehicle, the author must be a philosopher of the first rank. But in our age we can find but few first-rate philosophers.

It may be objected that, although Goldsmith did not write the passage himself, he could hardly have failed to see its applicability. This may be granted, without lessening the improbability of his having included it on that account. The unifying theme of the essay is the effect of reading on the minds of young people, and each passage which Goldsmith has culled from the pages of Du Halde illustrates one aspect of that theme. The passage under discussion is simply one of those illustrations. Furthermore, if he had wished his readers to make a special application of this particular passage, he almost certainly would have pointed it, by some slight changes, to fit more exactly the object of his attack.

As the essay stands, and as the various interpretations of this passage show, the criticism applies as much to Richardson as it does to Fielding, and perfectly to neither. We may safely assume, then, that any subtle motive attributed to Goldsmith in this passage did not exist, and that here, as later in the case of his *History of England*, he intended "no harm to nobody."

Wellesley College.

KATHARINE C. BALDERSTON.

GOLDSMITH AND JOHNSON ON BIOGRAPHY

Attention has been drawn of late to the fact that Goldsmith's knowledge of foreign—particularly of French—literature led to frequent, and all too often unacknowledged, borrowing from such sources in his early writings.¹ Rarely, however, do we find indebtedness to his English contemporaries, doubtless for the excellent reason that so obvious a procedure would invite discipline from the self-appointed literary police of Grub Street. It is the more interesting and surprising, therefore, to find that Goldsmith's remarks on the art of biography in the opening paragraphs of his *Life of Richard Nash, Esq.*, echo the ideas and sometimes the phraseology of no less a writer than Samuel Johnson, whose essay on this subject in the *Idler* had appeared a scant three years earlier. So far as I know, the parallel which follows has not heretofore been noted. To facilitate comparison without disturbing the sequence of either passage, sections from Goldsmith are numbered to correspond with their parallels in Johnson.

The Idler, No. 84, Nov. 24, 1759.
(Johnson's *Works*, ed. Hawkins,
1787, 8. 339-41.)

(1) The examples and events of history press, indeed, upon the mind with the weight of truth; but when they are repositied in the

*The Life of Richard Nash, Esq.*²
(Goldsmith's *Works*, ed. Gibbs,
453-4.)

(1) History owes its excellence more to the writer's manner than to the materials of which it is composed. (3) The intrigues of

¹ See *Les Sources françaises de Goldsmith*, by A. L. Sells, Paris, 1924; Oliver Goldsmith's "The Citizen of the World," by H. J. Smith, Yale Studies in English, LXXI, 1926; "Goldsmith's Indebtedness to Voltaire and Justus van Effen," by J. E. Brown, *Modern Philology*, XXIII (1926), 273-84.

² First published in October, 1762.

memory, they are oftener employed for shew than use, and rather diversify conversation than regulate life. (2) Few are engaged in such scenes as give them opportunities of growing wiser by the downfall of statesmen or the defeat of generals. (3) The stratagems of war, and the intrigues of courts, are read by far the greater part of mankind with the same indifference as the adventures of fabled heroes, or the revolutions of a fairy region. (4) Between falsehood and useless truth there is little difference. As gold which he cannot spend will make no man rich, so knowledge which he cannot apply will make no man wise.

(5) The mischievous consequences of vice and folly, of irregular desires and predominant passions, are best discovered by those relations which are levelled with the general surface of life, which tell not how any man became great, but how he was made happy; not how he lost the favour of his prince, but how he became discontented with himself. (6) Those relations are therefore commonly of most value in which the writer tells his own story . . . (7) The high and low, as they have the same faculties and the same senses, have no less similitude in their pains and pleasures. The sensations are the same in all, though produced by very different occasions. The prince feels the same pain when an invader seizes a province, as the farmer when a thief drives away his cow. Men thus equal in themselves will appear

courts, or the devastation of armies, are regarded by the remote spectator with as little attention as the squabbles of a village, or the fate of a malefactor, that falls under his own observation. (7) The great and the little, as they have the same senses, and the same affections, generally present the same picture to the hand of the draughtsman; and whether the hero or the clown be the subject of the memoir, it is only man that appears with all his native minuteness about him; for nothing very great was ever yet formed from the little materials of humanity.*

(5) Thus none can properly be said to write history, but he who understands the human heart, and its whole train of affections and follies. Those affections and follies are properly the materials he has to work upon. The relations of great events may surprise indeed; they may be calculated to instruct those very few who govern the million beneath, but the generality of mankind find the most real improvement from relations which are levelled to the general surface of life—which tell—not how men learned to conquer, but how they endeavoured to live—not how they gained the shout of the admiring crowd, but how they acquired the esteem of their friends and acquaintance.

(6) Every man's own life would perhaps furnish the most pleasing materials for history, if he only had candour enough to be sincere, and skill enough to select such parts as once making him more

* Cf. *Rambler*, No. 60. (*Works*, ed. cit., 5. 382-83.)

equal in honest and impartial biography.

prudent, might serve to render his readers more cautious . . . (2) It were to be wished that ministers and kings were left to write their own histories: they are truly useful to few but themselves; but for men who are contented with more humble stations, I fancy such truths only are serviceable as may conduct them safely through life. (4) That knowledge which we can turn to our real benefit should be most eagerly pursued. Treasures which we cannot use but little increase the happiness, or even the pride, of the possessor.

A few other minor resemblances between the two authors on the subject of biography may be added:

Rambler, No. 60, Oct. 13, 1750.
(*Works*, ed. cit., 5. 382.)

I have often thought that there has rarely passed a life of which a judicious and faithful narrative would not be useful.

Life of Sir Thomas Browne.
(*Works*, ed. cit., 4. 604.)

. . . those minute peculiarities which discriminate every man from all others, if they are not recorded by those whom personal knowledge enables to observe them, are irrecoverably lost.

Life of Thomas Parnell.⁴ (*Works*, ed. Gibbs, 4. 159.)

There is scarce any man but might be made the subject of a very interesting and amusing history, if the writer, besides a thorough acquaintance with the character he draws, were able to make those nice distinctions which separate it from all others. The strongest minds have usually the most striking peculiarities . . . but in the present instance, from not knowing Dr. Parnell, his peculiarities are gone to the grave with him, and we are obliged to take his character from such as knew but little of him, or who, perhaps, could have given very little information if they had known more.⁵

⁴ Published in 1770.

⁵ See also *Memoirs of M. de Voltaire* (ed. Gibbs, 4. 8-9): "I am not insensible, that by recounting these trifling particulars of a great man's life, I may be accused of being myself a trifler; but such circumstances as these generally best mark a character . . . Let this, then, be my

Thus Goldsmith, in advance of most of his contemporaries, accepted in theory—and illustrated in practice, one may add—a conception of biography that was soon to be further perfected in *The Lives of the Poets* and Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, and was even to become the basis of present-day methods. The ideal of truth rather than panegyric, the will to pierce through the outer vestments of public acts to the real man within, the importance of the trivial and of the shadows as well as the lights of character to the moralist and the artist seeking convincing, rounded portraiture—such, in general, were the principles of these three biographers. And the dominating influence upon Goldsmith as well as upon Boswell was that of Johnson.

JOSEPH E. BROWN.

Princeton University.

THE INFLUENCE OF E. A. POE ON JUDITH GAUTIER

In an article entitled "The Influence of Edgar Allen Poe in France" appearing in the *Romanic Review*, Oct.-Dec., 1926, pp. 319-337, Prof. C. P. Cambiare has clearly shown how much modern French literature has been influenced by the example and theories of Poe. After showing that Théophile Gautier came under the influence of the American story-teller, he wrote (p. 331): "As Gautier occupies an important place in the history of fantastic fiction in France, Poe's influence on him is reflected in his disciples." Further than this, Cambiare did not go. It is interesting to note, however, that Poe seems to have influenced, through Baudelaire's translations, Gautier's eldest daughter, Judith, in her youth. In her memoirs she stated that she read Poe's stories as they came out in Baudelaire's version.¹ Her father, she added, used to discuss Poe's stories with his children, and she asserted

excuse, if I mention anything that seems derogatory from Voltaire's character, which will be found composed of little vices and great virtues. Besides, it is not here intended either to compose a panegyric or draw up an invective; truth only is my aim," etc. A similar conception of the biographer's function later appears in Johnson's remarks as recorded by Boswell: *Life*, ed. G. B. Hill, 2. 166, 446; 3. 155; 4. 53, 65; 5. 238.

¹ J. Gautier, *le Second Rang du collier des jours*, p. 38.

that as a child she had proposed another way of telling the story of the *Gold Bug*,² which led her father to urge her to try writing.³

When Baudelaire's translation of *Eureka* appeared (1864), Gautier gave the book to Judith with the request that she should analyze it fully and try to write an article about it for her father's sake.⁴ A week later, the article was ready. Her father did not allude to it again, but sent it secretly to the *Moniteur universel*, signed *Judith Walter*, his translation of the name Gautier. To her surprise her essay appeared on March 29th, and she was paid Frs. 80.40 for it. She was also rewarded by a complimentary letter from Baudelaire, to whom Gautier had shown the proofs of the article, of which two paragraphs may be quoted:

Dans votre analyse si correcte d'*Eureka*, vous avez fait ce qu'à votre âge je n'aurais peut-être su faire, et ce qu'une foule d'hommes très mûrs, et se disant lettrés, sont incapables de faire. Enfin vous m'avez prouvé ce que j'aurais volontiers jugé impossible, c'est qu'une jeune fille peut trouver dans les livres des amusements sérieux, tout à fait différents de ceux si bêtes et si vulgaires qui remplissent la vie de toutes les femmes. Si je ne craignais pas encore de vous offenser en médiant de votre sexe, je vous dirais que vous m'avez contraint à douter moi-même de vilaines opinions que je me suis forgées à l'égard des femmes en général. (*op. cit.*, p. 67).

Elsewhere in these memoirs, Judith Gautier gave the scenario of the first story which she invented at the age of fifteen. It was the tale of a mad violin-maker who murdered a great singer and used her hair for his bows and human gut for strings.⁵ Her father, after hearing this "abominable histoire," declared that it showed the influence of Edgar Poe, and that he, perhaps, could have made something out of this horrible adventure. In repro-

² *Ibid.*, pp. 52-3, "—Pourquoi la découverte du trésor est-elle réalisée avant l'explication du parchemin mystérieux qui en indique la place? Il était plus naturel de suivre William Legrand dans les émotions du déchiffrement, les recherches à travers l'île et enfin les péripéties de la découverte,—que l'erreur du nègre, qui confond l'œil gauche de la tête de mort avec l'œil droit, suffit à dramatiser.—Edgar Poë prend le sujet à rebours, et c'est seulement après le dénouement, qu'il explique comment il a pu l'amener."

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 152-6.

ducing this anecdote, Judith Gautier seemed to acknowledge that her first attempts to write were indeed made under the influence of Poe. Although her first books were concerned with Far Eastern subjects: *le Livre de jade*, translations from the Chinese, 1867, *le Dragon impérial*, a novel, 1869; in the latter book, Chapter X, "les Pieds du pendu," is composed entirely in the manner of a story by Poe.

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ.

Stanford University.

THE BURNING OF HEOROT: AN ILLUSTRATIVE NOTE

The ultimate destruction of Heorot by fire is hinted at twice in the *Beowulf*, in vv. 82-83 and 781-82 respectively. This was, we know, the all too common fate of Germanic frame structures, and similar situations in other literary documents have been pointed out by editors of the poem.¹ The two following illustrations, both from Bede, commend themselves by virtue of their matter-of-factness, circumstance, and close geographical and chronological relationships to the OE. poem.

The first is part of the account of a miracle worked by Aidan against the destruction of Bamborough by Penda in 651 A. D.; it describes the technique of firing a town (or fortification) from without:

. . . . discissisque uiculis, quos in uicinia urbis inuenit, aduexit illo plurimam congeriem trabium, tignorum, parietum, uirgeorum, et tecti fenei, et his urbem in magna altitudine circumdedit a parte, quae terrae est contigua, et dum uentum opportunum cerneret, inlato igne conburere urbem nisus est. (*Eccl. Hist.*, III, 16; ed. Plummer, I, p. 159).

Such may have been the technique unsuccessfully employed against Heorot by the Heaðobards under Ingeld.²

The second illustration occurs in connection with a miracle ascribed to the power of dust taken from the spot on which King

¹ E. g., Gummere, *Oldest English Epic*, note to v. 83; Holthausen, *Beowulf*, II (4th ed., 1919), p. 107, notes to vv. 82, 84.

² *Widsæð* (vv. 45-49) implies successful resistance by the Danes on this occasion.

Oswald died: 642 A.D. would not be far from the date of this event.

Intrauitque [quidam] in domum, in qua uicani caenantes epulabantur; et susceptus a dominis domus, resedit et ipse cum eis ad conuiuium, adpendens linteolum cum puluere, quem adtulerat, in una posta parietis. Cumque diutius epulis atque ebrietati uacarent, accenso grandi igne in medio, contigit uolantibus in altum scintillis culmen domus, quod erat uirgis contextum, ac foeno tectum, subitaneis flammis impleri. Quod cum repente conuiuae terrore confusi conspicerent, fugerunt foras nil ardenti domui et iamiamque periturae prodesse ualentes. (*Eccl. Hist.*, III, 10; ed. Plummer, I, p. 147).

The scene here so vividly described gives a striking picture of contemporary helplessness against fire and of what may have been the circumstances of the burning of Heorot, hinted at in the *Beowulf*.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University.

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER BY LOUIS RACINE

Louis Racine's famous poem *La Religion* (in six cantos, not four, as Lanson states p. 648 of *Man. Bibl.*) first published in Paris in 1742, had a very considerable popularity in its day, appearing in several editions during the eighteenth century, and being translated into English, German, Italian, and Latin. Seeking to gain ecclesiastical approval for his poem, Racine sent a copy of an early edition to Pope Benedict XIV, together with a letter in Latin, wherein he gave expression to his firmness in the faith. The pope replied with a gracious letter of thanks, which was forwarded to Racine along with a note from the Cardinal Valenti, Secretary of State at the Vatican. Racine, apparently greatly flattered by these two letters, replied on March 15, 1743, from Paris, stating that "Jamais les muses n'ont pu procurer à ceux qu'elles ont le plus favorisés une gloire comparable à celle que me procure Votre Eminence."

Believing this correspondence important, Racine made copies of the four letters and sent them, glued into a copy of *La Religion*, to an unnamed gentleman at Paris, perhaps the Royal librarian.

With this he sent the following unpublished note: "J'espère, Monsieur, que vous voudrez bien remettre, comme vous me l'avez promis, cet exemplaire à la Bibliothèque du Roi et le faire insérer sur le catalogue. J'ai écrit à la tête une copie de la lettre que j'ai pris la liberté d'adresser à Sa Sainteté en lui envoyant un pareil exemplaire. Il est important pour moi que cette lettre subsiste, parcequ'elle contient dans toute leur sincérité mes sentiments de soumission sur la doctrine. J'ai l'honneur d'être avec un inviolable attachement, Monsieur, votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur. L. Racine. à Soissons, le 27 février, 1744." (Manuscript letter found in Bib. Nat. Ye 2427). It is especially to be noted that Louis Racine wished that his correspondence with the pope be preserved. In fact, in some of the eighteenth century editions of the poem the letters exchanged between Racine and Rome are printed, but, unfortunately, in the standard edition of Racine's *Oeuvres* by Lenormant of 1808 (Lanson says 1868, *loc. cit.*) the correspondence, so closely connected with *La Religion*, does not accompany it.

GEORGE B. WATTS.

Davidson College.

AARON HILL AND THOMSON'S *SOPHONISBA*

The following verses, hitherto unprinted, are written in the autograph of Aaron Hill on the verso of the title-page of a copy of the first edition of Thomson's *Sophonisba* in the Yale University Library. The play is bound up with several others by Thomson and Hill, the first of which bears on its title-page the signature "E. Lowther." This is, presumably, the Mrs. Lowther to whom Hill addressed at least one of the letters in his published correspondence, and the Mrs. L——r who inspired his poem *To Mrs. L——r, playing on a Bass-Viol*.

It is amusing to note that Hill's praise of Thomson, so unrestrained in his letters to the poet and in his public utterances, is here greatly qualified, although it is hard to say whether the qualification is motivated by critical honesty or by the desire to pay a neat compliment.

The volume containing the verses has been cut down in the process of binding, with the result that the first one or two letters of each line have disappeared. These letters have been restored in square brackets in the transcript below.

TO MRS. LOWTHER.

[Sw]eetness like Yours, will scarce condemn this Play,
[O]r judge the Author by his first Essay;
[Sh]ou'd Sophonisba too much Fire express,
[Un]temper'd by her Sexe's Tenderness,
[Th]ink from what Copies, his rough Painting came;
[Sc]otland's bleak Hills inspire no gentle Flame:
[Ha]d He been bred where smiling Beauty grew,
[An]d learnt your Sexe's softening Charms from You,
[He] had not give'n the Fair so fierce a Dress,
[N]or, meaning more than Woman, made her Less.

A. HILL

York \bar{y} 23^d of April. 1730.

ARTHUR E. CASE.

Yale University.

THE TERM *STURM UND DRANG*

In his valuable monograph *Early References to Storm and Stress in German Literature*¹ Professor Edwin H. Zeydel clears up the misconceptions that have prevailed concerning the use of the term *Sturm und Drang* as a designation of "the revolutionary movement that dominated German literature during the decade from 1770 to 1780." Professor Zeydel, who points out that Hildebrand, in Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, s. v. *Genie*, is unable to cite a single clear instance of such use prior to Tieck, 1828, adduces examples from texts of the years 1784, 1793, and 1803.

A still earlier instance may be cited from the rare *A B C Buch für grosse Kinder*, Wien, 1782, the *Nachrede* of which is dated Dec. 16, 1781. The work proper is anonymous, but a *Zweytes Heft*, 1782, bears the name of Joseph Richter, to whom Meusel (VI, 350) also ascribes the work, whilst an *Anhang* to the first

¹ *Indiana University Studies*, Vol. XIII, No. 71, Sept. 1926.

part bears the presumably fictitious name of Johann Strommer. The book is a satire on contemporary events, and was probably patterned upon Bahrdt's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-Almanach aufs Jahr 1781*, the difference consisting in the fact that not proper names, but words such as *Altväterisch*, *Jesuiten*, *Kenner*, *Pabst*, *Scheiterhaufen*, *Vaterland*, and *Weltbürger* are used as the vehicle of the author's persiflage, which, as will be noted, is contemporary with the "Reformation" of Joseph II. Under *Originalgenie* there is the following entry:

Originalgenie. Werden nur wieder von Generalgenien^{*} verstanden. Ein Unheiliger faßt das all nicht. Hat keinen Sinn dafür.—Weis nicht was Sturm und Drang ist—Es wirft ihm nicht in den Eingeweiden; hingegen erspart er sich aber auch bey reiffen Jahren Erröthen, ein Originalgenie gewesen zu seyn.

We have here not merely the earliest known instance of the use of *Sturm und Drang* in the technical sense—it is even coupled with the alternative term *Originalgenie*, which it serves to define.

W. KURRELMAYER.

^{*} Probably misprint for *Originalgenien*.

REVIEWS

MATERIALS FOR THE STUDY OF THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE.

Workers in the Tudor and Stuart period have reason to be grateful for the constantly increasing supply of original sources put at their disposal through the generosity of publishers and scholarly editors. Time was when the necessary material could only be had by travel to a large library. Even pioneer work by scholars like Arber and Grosart was available only in very limited editions, not particularly attractive in form, and sold at high prices certain to become still higher when the few copies set apart for the general public had been absorbed. Now there are many series, delightfully printed and bound, reasonable in price, reprints of works almost inaccessible a few years ago.

In the extremely useful Bodley Head Quartos, for example, rare tracts by Greene, Nashe, Chettle, Dekker, and others may be had.¹ Daniel's *Defense of Ryme* and Campion's *History of English Poesie* have recently appeared in one of these volumes, edited with a brief introduction by G. B. Harrison. The same scholar has given us, in another volume in the Bodley series, a reprint of Marston's *Scourge of Villanie*. The excellent introduction shows the relation of Marston's satire to the wave of disillusion and bitter reaction that followed the glorious Armada period. Shakespeare is not alone in expressing this reaction in the plays of his so-called tragic period; the thing is characteristic of the thought and literature of the time. In Marston, as in *Hamlet* and *Lear*, there is a melancholy more bitter than the affected melancholy of Jaques.

Of greater interest because of the perplexing problems which it raises is G. B. Harrison's edition, also in the Bodley Quartos, of *Willobie His Avisa*. Outwardly this poem was written in praise of a chaste wife, who repulsed suitors of various nationalities. Published in 1594, Hadrian Dorrell's preface "To the Reader" gives it a quasi-philosophical setting, explains *Avisa* as an anagram (*amans. uxor. inviolata. semper. amanda.*), expressing a Platonic idea of a constant wife; links the poem with Plato's *Commonwealth* and More's *Utopia*; holds that the suitors represent racial types of lovers (Italian, Spanish, French, German, and English), but concludes by saying that the poem may refer to real events, since he heard of such a woman once in the west of England. Two years later, however, Dorrell retracted this suggestion, insisting that *Avisa* was purely fictitious and that the poem had been

¹ The Bodley Head Quartos, New York. Dutton. Fifteen volumes published.

written at least thirty-five years earlier. Since we know that the poem was "to be called in" in 1599, and that the verses by Vigilantius Dormitanus which follow Dorrell's Epistle clearly link the poem to *Lucrece*, it is evident that we have a very pretty problem. To the solution of the problem the editor contributes an essay in which these and other related matters are set forth, the conclusion being that the poem marks the rivalry between the Raleigh group and the Essex-Southampton group, that H. W. is Southampton and W. S., Shakespeare, and that the poem is an answer to *The Rape of Lucrece*. These conclusions, I think, must be held as conjectural only. There is too little evidence for the identification of H. W. and W. S., tempting though such identification may be. The connection with Raleigh is plausible but distinctly not proven. The connection with Lucrece may or may not be significant, for it may mean no more than that we have here another story of a chaste wife beset by suitors, with a happier outcome. But it is certain that the poem had to its first readers a significance quite apart from the story and the pseudo-philosophical setting given it by Dorrell. The present edition ought to turn students once more to the problem.

With the exception of *Willobie His Avis*, the chief value of The Bodley Head Quartos is that they give us inexpensive texts. For more elaborately edited reprints of Elizabethan works we must continue to look elsewhere. Miss Ethel Seaton, for example, has recently given us a splendid edition of *Venus and Anchises* and other poems by Phineas Fletcher.² The edition is based on a manuscript in the Library of Sion College and is published for the Royal Society of Literature. The discovery of this manuscript, as Dr. Boas remarks in his Preface, "is one of the minor romances of research." The chief poem in it has a title which marks its Shakespearian relationship; it has a different beginning from that of *Britains Ida*; and it is preceded by two stanzas in which Fletcher appears as its author under his pen-name of Thirsil. Thus is settled for all time the controversy over the authorship of a poem ascribed in 1628 to Spenser. Internal evidence, of course, long ago took *Britains Ida* from the Spenser canon and ascribed it to Fletcher, but here we have the final proof, as well as an unexpected justification for argument by internal evidence. Miss Seaton also adds to the Fletcher canon a long *Epithalamium* and gives important textual matter on poems previously known. She is also able to make important additions to our knowledge of Fletcher's life. "Ida crew," she holds, refers to Ide Hill, in Kent, to which the poet bids farewell. *Venus and Anchises* is early work. The

² *Venus and Anchises (Britains Ida) and Other Poems by Phineas Fletcher*. N. Y. Oxford, 1926. Pp. li, 125. Price \$3.50.

editor inclines to sanction Grosart's conjecture that Fletcher allowed Walkeley to print the poem as Spenser's because the country parson desired to obscure his connection with so pagan a poem, and supports the view by a quotation from Fletcher's *The Way to Blessedness* (1632). The new *Epithalamium* belongs to the same early period, before Fletcher's conversion, in its pagan and sensuous tone, and is thus markedly different from the poet's other marriage poems. The poem *Non invisa cano*, printed in the Quarto of 1633, acquires new importance because the Sion ms. has for its title "To Mr. Jo. Tomkins," thus identifying the Thomalin of the poem and also of the *Eclogs* and *Purple Island*. Tomkins, organist of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, and later organist at St. Paul's, was probably the composer of music for Fletcher's lyrics. These and other bits of evidence enable Miss Seaton to postulate two Norfolk periods: "one of youth and poetry and play, and the other of maturity and prose-writing and work."

In such a setting, *Venus and Anchises* is re-read with new delight. The Sion ms. does not have the divisions into cantos and the doggerel arguments inserted by Walkeley in order to make the poem seem to be Spenser's. The marriage hymn is an interesting addition to our collection of Elizabethan Epithalamia. The commentary supplies parallels between Fletcher and Sidney.

Mr. F. P. Wilson's edition of the Plague Pamphlets of Dekker will be of use for a variety of reasons.³ It adds to the materials for the convenient study of Elizabethan prose. The material is of interest both for content and style. The pamphlets are related to the newspapers of later times, and to the broadside ballads such as Professor Rollins is editing in a series of volumes. Dekker's sense of the dramatic is shown in the artful construction of "The Wonderful Year" and also in a different way in such a tract as "The Meeting of Gallants." The editor stresses his humanity, his sympathy for the common people, his hatred of usurers and others who preyed upon the miseries of the people. Dekker keenly appraises the way in which the prodigious sufferings of the people brought out the dross and the nobility of human nature. The tracts are full of local allusions; they are a mine for the study of the language; on both these points the editor's notes and his index are invaluable. For story interest and technique (for example, the stories of the lovers, of the sexton, and of the tinker); for illustration of the peculiar mixture of pathos and humor that is one characteristic of the Elizabethan literature, and for the excellence of a prose less mannered than that of Sidney and Lyly and yet not quite modern, the book will find a place. There are

³ *The Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker*. Edited by F. P. Wilson. N. Y. Oxford, 1925. Pp. xxxix, 268.

special topics, too, such as what Dekker holds of the state of learning and of poetry; what he says of map-travel; most of all, perhaps, his sense of the futility of the contemporary science when confronted by the national crisis of the plague. Professor Soddy has recently spoken of the contrast between the age-long ascription to Providence of such plague spots as the old Panama and the scientific work which made Panama as safe a place to live in as New York. The idea is in Dekker. Most people, he says, explain the plague as a punishment sent from Providence—

. . . and that's the common spell
That leades our Ignorance, (blinde as hell)
And serves but as excuse, to keepe
The soule from search of things more deepe.

It is true that the analysis of these deeper things that follows is not exactly what modern science would give; Dekker has not seen the whole truth; still, there runs through the tracts something of the same scorn of the superstitious science of the time that we find in Jonson. For the study of Dekker, therefore, this little book will take high place. Only two of the six tracts have been previously printed as Dekker's; one other has been reprinted, but without ascription to Dekker; the three remaining pamphlets are here reprinted for the first time. The introduction discusses bibliography and authorship; the text is an accurate reprint of the first editions.

Dr. McClure's edition of Harington's *Epigrams* presents no such fascinating problems as *Willobie His Avis* or the Sion ms. of Fletcher, but it gives us a much more detailed account of the life of the translator of Ariosto than can be found elsewhere, and besides the epigrams of the edition of 1633 contains eighty-two epigrams previously unpublished.⁴ The biography, which will supplant both Creighton's account in *DNB* and Professor Raleigh's essay, is abundantly documented. The text is based upon that of the first complete edition (1618) with collations from two autograph mss. in the British Museum and the Cambridge University Library, the additional epigrams in the BM. ms. being printed for the first time. The edition also includes a commentary showing Harington's debt to Martial and a few other authors. Harington differs, however, from most epigrammatists of his time in the facts that he draws more upon his own experience and observation than upon literary models, and that while he is a satirist, he is urbane and not cynical. Some of his epigrams are "merry tales"; many of them throw light upon the life of his times, both

⁴ The Epigrams of Sir John Harington. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Norman Egbert McClure. Philadelphia, The University of Pennsylvania, 1926. Pp. 250.

court and pastoral; they bear witness to the wit that made him such a favorite with the Queen, although this wit perhaps prevented him from being taken seriously enough to justify promotion. Dr. McClure is inclined perhaps to press this last point a bit too far. Certainly Harington, for all his love for his country place near Bath and for his wife, his well-instructed children, and his well-fed cattle, was drawn by the court as by a magnet, and certainly he failed to rise. His one most considerable sally, as an attendant of Essex on the Irish expedition, brought him only a somewhat disreputable knighthood and but for his diary might have brought him under suspicion at the time when Essex fell. But despite the glamor of court, the friends he had there, his witty enjoyment of what he saw, his real analysis of it is very like Spenser's. Passages in his diary read almost like the autobiographical passages in "Colin Clout's Come Home Again."

For several reasons Professor Mead's edition of *Chinon of England* and of Robinson's translation of Leland's *Assertio inclytissimi Arturii* is a work of cardinal importance to workers in this field.⁵ Middleton's romance, here first printed since the original edition of 1597, is a curious re-appearance of Arthurian romance material in the closing decade of the sixteenth century, and was perhaps suggested by the popularity of the *Faerie Queene*. Professor Mead gives an admirable survey of Arthurian romance in the Elizabethan period, and in his introduction and notes discusses the relation of Middleton's work to the great cycle and to Huon of Bordeaux. The romance is of no great merit, being a compound of impossible and irrational adventures. There is more fairy lore in it than in Huon; it introduces some of the great heroes, Lancelot, for example; it is quasi-medieval only, for there is a large classical element in it. On such matters Professor Mead writes with authority. He does not point out obvious indebtedness of Middleton, however, to the Italian romances (the love-madness connected with the vial of water, for example) or to Sidney. Middleton's debt to Arcadian rhetoric he notes, but not such incidents as that of the girl imprisoned by the wicked enchantress, clearly drawn from the Cecropia episode in *Arcadia*. Indeed, the romance seems to be an attempt to make use of the technique (oracles, bizarre adventures, love complaints, etc.) of the English romances drawn from the Greek tradition, plus characters and some of the incidents of medieval Arthurian story. The curious amalgamation is suggested by the very opening of the story. Laura, the lovely princess

⁵ The Famous Historie of Chinon of England by Christopher Middleton; to which is added The Assertion of King Arthure. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by William Edward Mead. Lond. E. E. T. S. (Oxford Press), 1925. Pp. lxxviii, 85; xiii, 155.

whose beauty attracts young men from every quarter of the world, is own sister to the heroines of Sidney and Lodge; Chionon, her brother, is a Perceval or Sir Gareth, a Fair Unknown aroused to a life of chivalric adventure after Lancelot, marvelous to tell, falls in love with Laura. It is this Elizabethan element that Professor Mead fails in his introduction and commentary to bring into relation with the ancient tradition.

The reprint of Robinson's translation of Leland's defense of Arthur is of importance for a quite different reason. Professor Mead gives a clear account of the controversy about Arthur that raged among antiquaries during the sixteenth century. Rastell, earliest of the group, neglected or failed to perceive the problem. But Polydore Vergil's attack on the historicity of Arthur in 1534 was followed by others, including Holinshed, and provoked defences from Leland (1544) and Robinson who translated Leland's tract in 1582. Robinson's significance in relation to this whole matter Professor Mead does not point out. It is not merely a question of growing historical sense. It is quite clear, from the dedication to Grey of Wilton (Spenser's Artegall), Sir Henry Sidney (Lord President of Wales) and Thomas Smith, as it is clear also in the Epistle Dedicatorie, the verses "to the Syncere Readers," and the Assertion itself, that Leland and Robinson sought to exalt Briton as against Saxon claims to merit as the founders of all that was great in England. This, of course, is a form of the historical primitivism that is constantly met with in Elizabethan literature, that led to the exaltation of the Tudors as restorers of the pristine British glory, and that motivates Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Students of Spenser, therefore, would do well to give attention to Professor Mead's book, not alone as a reprint of Arthurian material surviving in the age of Elizabeth but as material for the study of historical primitivism in Spenser's time.*

Of a quite different nature is J. M. Lloyd Thomas's edition of

* Professor Mead's treatment of Leland seems to me to be somewhat unfair. Leland was an antiquary, not an historian, but it may be doubted if Polydore's scepticism and cavalier methods of accepting or rejecting material are any sounder than Leland's painstaking research at the seat of traditions such as those clustering about Glastonbury. How thorough Leland's work was comes out incidentally in Dean Robinson's recent book, *Two Glastonbury Legends* (Cambridge, 1926). As for the translator of Leland, Mead remarks (p. x, n. 3) that "his most interesting addition to Leland—derived from his learned friend Master Steven Batman—is that Arthur is descended from Joseph of Arimathea!" There is no occasion for surprise; the idea is in some of the Latin Chronicles (Fletcher, 189) and in John of Glastonbury's History (*Two Glastonbury Legends*, 34-35). The verses partly supporting Robinson's note, which Mead adduces as a sample of the translator's credulity, may be found, in another version, in the book by the Dean of Wells already cited (34).

the autobiography of Richard Baxter.⁷ With it we are translated from the realm of Arthurian magic and Tudor supremacy to the troubled political and religious scenes of the Civil Wars. Mr. Thomas has made a most delightful book through an abridgement of the *Reliquiae Baxterianae* of 1696. There are twenty-five chapters, in three parts, the whole giving a connected story, in Baxter's own words, of his life, his reading, and his opinions. There are a dozen illustrations; the book is attractively printed and bound, and it will find many readers who cannot get access, or would not if they could, to the original, or to such highly unsatisfactory transformations as the abridgement of 1702. The introductory essay is an admirable companion. It is fully documented. It guides the reader to the chief elements in Baxter's philosophy of life. It opens the eyes to the significance of this "ascetic figure stepping out of the mists of the seventeenth century and appealing to the sympathies of the modern mind." Baxter's was a rich and powerful mind; his prose style is idiomatic, direct, sincere, free from every artifice. His autobiography is a document of high importance for estimating the times of the Commonwealth and the Restoration. What he says of Cromwell, of his people, of the Plague, of the religious quarrels which followed the return of the King, of the Bishops, is all of value. Even more valuable is the revelation of his own character through the passages devoted to self-analysis and in the sure but unconscious portraiture which we discern in this long record of the acts of his daily life.

Three recent anthologies may also be noted as supplying original material for the study of the period. The first of these, Professor Zeitlin's *Seventeenth Century Essays*, is primarily a college text but it merits notice because it represents a field hitherto largely neglected by anthologists.⁸ Nichol Smith's *Characters of Seventeenth Century* traverses much of the same ground, but it is after all limited to the *character*. Mr. Zeitlin writes a conventional introduction, with the usual discussion of the essay as a type, of Montaigne *versus* Bacon, and of the *character*. He strangely omits Cowley, both from his introduction and his text.

Mr. Norman Ault's *Elizabethan Lyrics* is based, he tells us, upon his own examination of some two thousand printed books and three hundred manuscripts.⁹ There are, inevitably, many

⁷ The Autobiography of Richard Baxter. Edited by J. M. Lloyd Thomas. New York. Dutton. 1925. Pp. xxxvii, 312.

⁸ Seventeenth Century Essays. Edited by Jacob Zeitlin. N. Y. Scribner, 1926.

⁹ Elizabethan Lyrics. Chosen, edited, and arranged by Norman Ault. N. Y. Longmans, 1925. Pp. xv, 536.

poems already familiar to users of anthologies. But there are also many of exceeding rarity, others never before printed, and still others here printed in more complete or more accurate forms. Moreover, the editor arranges his material not by author or by subject but by years of publication or probable composition. Thus we have, as the editor suggests, means for tracing the evolution of the Elizabethan lyric from Wyatt to about 1620. The inclusion of longer poems such as Spenser's marriage hymns, of lyrics inserted in narrative poems such as the *Faerie Queene*, and of some eighty lyrics belonging to the period between the time of Wyatt and Surrey and the time of Sidney, is a feature of the book. The notes are very brief, of necessity, but they are usually very valuable. Besides the usual index of authors and index of first lines there is an admirable index of subjects, which alone bears witness to the extraordinary scope and variety of theme of the Elizabethan lyric.

Our anthologies conclude with a splendid volume by Professor Rollins containing forty ballads of the seventeenth century to which the editor has given the happy title of *The Pack of Autolycus*.¹⁰ It is difficult to write adequately of the scholarly characteristics of this book for sheer delight in its beauty. It is a fitting companion to its predecessors in the notable series which Professor Rollins and the Harvard Press are giving us. Besides the paper, the type, the binding, all of which evidence supreme skill in the making of fine books, there are numerous woodcuts which give a more authentic air of age to the book than the usual devices by which modern reprints are clad in a fictitious antiquity. The book is modern, but it is in superb keeping with the spirit of the age in which these broadsides first saw the light. As to the ballads themselves, the editor's sub-title "Strange and Terrible News" accurately explains not only his main title but the way in which these ballads appealed to their first readers. They are delightfully sensational. They give a cross-section of seventeenth century English life as accurate as that which we gain, on different lines, from Baxter's autobiography or the Bodley Quartos. And the editor's notes, as always, are full, scholarly, and illuminating.

I turn, in closing, to two recent books, closely similar in plan, which are primarily handbooks for students but are nevertheless of importance to Elizabethan scholarship. The first of these is a part of the Yale edition of Shakespeare, and is titled *Shakespeare*

¹⁰The Pack of Autolycus or Strange and Terrible News of Ghostes, Apparitions, Monstrous Births, Showers of Wheat, Judgments of God, and Other Prodigious and Fearful Happenings as told in Broadside Ballads of the Years 1624-1693. Edited by Hyder Edward Rollins. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1927.

of *Stratford*.¹¹ In it Professor Tucker Brooke gives, first, "The Biographical Facts." Here are seventy items, reprints from documents, arranged chronologically, with compact notes supplying the information necessary to a correct understanding of the text, so that the student has in a single small volume all the source material upon which the biography of the dramatist, however extensive, must be based. This in itself is an impressive and salutary lesson; the whole exhibit occupies 97 pages. Second, the editor gives a list, also chronological, of documents mentioning Shakespeare which are either spurious or relating to a namesake of the poet, another warning against inaccuracy. Third, we have a list of the contemporary allusions to Shakespeare's plays, also chronological and supplied with the necessary annotation. Necessarily different in nature, the succeeding sections supply in brief form information on the printing of Shakespeare's works, with a table of quartos before 1633; information about the chronological order of the works, with a table; a discussion of Shakespeare's metrical development, also with an analytical table; a compact account of Shakespeare's Theatres; and an essay on the personality of Shakespeare, followed by an admirable index. The greater part of this unusual book is therefore correctly, though modestly, described on the cover as "Edited by Tucker Brooke." It is invaluable to the student and also to the experienced worker; nowhere else can so much source material be found on the subject in anything like the space or with anything approaching the clarity and effectiveness of its presentation.

Of Professor Brooke's closing essay, "The Personality of Shakespeare," something more should be said. It is dominated by the idea back of the title, "Shakespeare of Stratford." The thesis is that Shakespeare did not respond to the variegated life of Elizabethan London: that he took no interest in the tremendous national problems of foreign relations, colonial development, sea power; that his attitude toward the government was not Elizabethan but Plantagenet; that war was a subject for sporting interest only, Henry's famed speech at Agincourt being the triumph of foot-ball oratory; that, in short, we must look to Spenser, Marlowe, Jonson, Lyly, a dozen other men rather than to Shakespeare if we want to define to ourselves the true meaning of that mighty epoch. With much of this I find myself in accord. The essay is a merited rebuke to those who, perplexed by the mystery of genius, seek to ascribe the plays to Bacon, to Raleigh, to Southampton or Oxford or Rutland or any one else but Shakespeare of Stratford; it is a warning to those who find in the plays subtle direction and alle-

¹¹-Shakespeare of Stratford. By Tucker Brooke. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1926.

gory of Elizabethan statecraft; it is a needful reminder that we do not know Elizabethan thought or literature if we confine our study to Shakespeare. Yet I think that the thesis also contains seed of error. For after we have made all due allowance for the slightness of topical allusions, the failure to apostrophize Drake or Galileo, the small interest in photographic reflection of court or London street, the medieval quality of the religion used as background and the seeming utter lack of interest in the religious as well as the political interests of that age,—after we have deducted all this, and have substituted the facts that Shakespeare's attention was apparently fixed on his little world of the stage, or of Stratford, and not on the larger stage on which Spenser's intellect played, or Jonson's or Hooker's or Francis Bacon's, one step remains to be taken. Professor Brooke stops, I think, too soon. In one of his closing paragraphs he justly remarks that the spectrum of life, running from dreams through thoughts into acts, was for the Elizabethan brightest at the two ends, but that Shakespeare kept his eye on the middle of the spectrum; the deeds mattered less; when the thinking was over he lost interest. But, surely, this thinking is also of the Renaissance, of Elizabethan England. Shakespeare's analysis of the meaning of life, not of life in general or for all time, but of life in his own time, is different in form from Spenser's or Bacon's or Jonson's, but it is penetrating, just, and sure. We cannot understand the English Renaissance by fixing our attention solely upon Shakespeare; it is not less certain that we shall never understand it by neglecting him, or by viewing him merely as Shakespeare of Stratford.

Professor Hanford's little book upon Milton is of the same provenience as the one of which I have just been speaking.¹² Its aim, we are told, is to supply in brief compass a body of materials which will be useful in the scholarly study of the poet Milton. To this end the editor gives us, under the caption "Materials for Milton's Biography," all the autobiographical passages, the documents, the testimony of contemporaries, necessary to source study of the life. Succeeding chapters deal with the prose works and the poems, with style and versification, and with Milton's fame and influence. The appendix includes other autobiographical matter, with commentary, and a bibliography notable because it includes the rich materials found in scholarly journals, materials which in recent years have supplied us with the means for a juster appreciation of Milton's work. Professor Hanford has himself contributed largely to this new conception of Milton, particularly in his study of the early poems, of *Paradise Lost*, and of *Samson*.

¹² A Milton Handbook. By James Holly Hanford. N. Y., Crofts, 1926.

His command of the vast scholarly material that has grown up about the poet is extraordinary, and he has succeeded in digesting this material in such a way as to make its significance clear to the student. For this reason his book is invaluable. It is not a mere text-book, for it transmutes scholarship into learning, and so makes scholarship available.

EDWIN GREENLAW.

Le Romantisme. Ses origines germaniques. Influences étrangères et traditions nationales. Le Réveil du génie français. Par LOUIS REYNAUD. Paris: Armand Colin, 1926. Pp. viii + 288.

Voici un livre que l'on ne peut négliger, mais qui à côté d'aperçus neufs et originaux et d'indications utiles, contient bien des généralisations hâtives et hasardeuses et qui défend, avec véhémence, une thèse qui sera difficilement acceptée par les historiens littéraires. Avec une belle intrépidité, l'auteur lance un défi à ceux qui, avant lui, ont essayé de déterminer la part qu'ont prise à la révolution romantique les littératures de l'Angleterre et de l'Allemagne.

L'on entend formuler, à ce sujet, dit-il, des opinions qui dénotent une complète indifférence pour les problèmes les plus inépuisables de l'histoire littéraire comparée, parfois même une ignorance *de fait* des littératures étrangères, stupéfiante chez des gens qui ont sans cesse à la bouche des noms d'auteurs anglais et allemands (p. vii).

D'autre part, comme il nous déclare qu'une bibliographie, même réduite, aurait exigé un autre volume de la taille de celui-ci et que d'ailleurs ce travail "est avant tout un travail de recherches personnelles et directes sur les textes" (p. viii), nous sommes forcés ou bien de croire l'auteur sur parole, ou bien de nous reporter nous-mêmes aux textes. Nous n'avons pu le faire dans toutes les occasions: les quelques vérifications que nous avons faites ont par malheur donné des résultats tels que la plus grande prudence, pour ne pas dire la plus grande défiance, nous semble de mise dans l'utilisation du livre de M. Reynaud.

Ceux qui ont lu le volume qu'il a publié il y a cinq ans, *L'Influence allemande en France au XVIII^e et au XIX^e siècles*, Paris, Hachette, 1922, se souviennent de la thèse qui y était défendue:

Nulle influence étrangère n'a été plus puissante, depuis un siècle et demi, que celle de l'Allemagne. Moins apparente sans doute que l'influence anglaise, dont elle est d'ailleurs solidaire, elle a pénétré plus profondément, et a fini par atteindre parfois ces régions intimes de l'âme où s'élaborent les principes qui règlent la vie tout entière d'un peuple (p. 8).

La thèse d'aujourd'hui est que "La civilisation du XVIII^e et du XIX^e siècle sera essentiellement un phénomène anglais; en

seconde ligne seulement un phénomène allemand" (p. 3). On voit le changement qui s'est produit en cinq ans dans l'esprit de l'auteur. Après avoir découvert l'Allemagne voici qu'il vient de découvrir l'Angleterre. Il faut espérer que dans quelques années il nous donnera un troisième volume où il démontrera avec autant de fougue que la civilisation des deux derniers siècles est essentiellement un phénomène français, ce qu'il serait tout aussi aisé d'établir. Pour discuter le nouveau point de vue de M. Reynaud, un livre au moins aussi volumineux que celui qu'il a écrit serait nécessaire. On ne trouvera donc ici qu'une discussion de quelques aspects de la question.

Dans un premier chapitre, l'auteur entreprend de montrer *La Destruction des idées fondamentales par le déisme et le sensualisme anglo-allemands*. Si je comprends bien, ces idées fondamentales étaient :

les deux grands principes de discipline que sont le catholicisme et l'antiquité romaine surtout qui au XVII^e siècle, prend nettement le pas sur l'antiquité grecque si goûtée de la Renaissance . . . C'est à cette magnifique concentration et régularisation de la force éparse de l'époque précédente que le siècle de Corneille et de Descartes, de Bossuet, de Boileau et de Racine, doit sa grandeur unique (p. 30).

C'est fort possible et c'est sans doute vrai, mais pourquoi laisser de côté Pascal et La Rochefoucauld, Molière et Lafontaine ? Sans doute parce que leur catholicisme n'était pas de très bon aloi ou que l'on ne trouve pas chez eux cette magnifique concentration. M. Reynaud admet d'ailleurs aussitôt qu'à la fin du XVII^e siècle, les "courants cachés reparaissent de toute part," que "les anciennes conceptions relèvent peu à peu la tête contre l'idéal classique et catholique," que Fénelon plaide en faveur de la "nature," enfin que dans la littérature française elle-même il y a un "obscur mouvement de réaction" (p. 51). On ne peut même pas soutenir que sans l'influence anglaise ce mouvement n'aurait pas fini par l'emporter, puisque M. Reynaud constate que, dès 1685, "il y a eu un fléchissement de la vitalité française dans tous les domaines" et c'est, d'après lui, à cause de ce fléchissement que "les grands génies du siècle de Louis XIV cèdent la place à des talents secondaires, un La Bruyère, un Charles Perrault, un Regnard, bientôt un La Motte."

Si maintenant nous considérons le détail d'un peu plus près, nous pourrions constater une tendance marquée à attribuer à l'influence anglaise seule des courants dont l'origine remonte cependant à une date antérieure à 1685. M. Reynaud connaît peut-être très bien Mandeville, mais quand il nous dit que selon l'auteur de la *Fable des abeilles* "ce que nous appelons des vertus n'est que le résultat d'une hypocrisie et d'une vanité encouragées par les politiques dans des vues intéressées" (p. 27), il est permis de se demander s'il

connaît La Rochefoucauld. Voici de même la définition d'un romancier :

Le héros se laisse aller aux pires faiblesses, notamment de la chair . . . Il cueille sans scrupule toutes les occasions qui se présentent . . . On voit que [l'auteur] n'a pas un idéal très élevé. Il y a un peu de vulgarité dans sa nature. Il se complaît dans la description de scènes scabreuses, des ripailles, ou des grosses farces. Il lui arrive de comparer l'amour humain à l'amour des animaux. Ses femmes et ses jeunes filles même les plus sympathiques sont sensuelles avec gloutonnerie. C'est la morale de l'instinct jugé licite et bon en définitive.

De qui s'agit-il, de Scarron ou de Lesage? Pas du tout, mais bien de Fielding. Mais si exacte que soit cette analyse, on ne peut nier qu'elle ne puisse s'appliquer fort exactement à des auteurs français qui n'ont point connu l'Angleterre.

Ailleurs M. Reynaud affaiblit sa démonstration faute de choix et de discernement dans les faits qu'il recueille. Il nous déclare gravement que "le Régent et Dubois sont anglomanes comme la Palatine" et en note nous apprend entre autres choses que "Le Régent félicitera George I à son avènement," citant comme autorité "Wiesener, *Le Régent, l'abbé Dubois et les Anglais*, tome I, p. 3, 1891." Nous voilà fixés et quand les chefs d'état féliciteront le nouveau Mikado sur son avènement M. Reynaud ne manquera pas sans doute de les accuser de nippomanie. Protestant, sans d'ailleurs citer aucun nom, contre les historiens qui datent des *Lettres philosophiques* de Voltaire les débuts de l'influence anglaise, M. R. voit dans les *Lettres Persanes* "le premier exemple bien caractérisé" de cet esprit nouveau (p. 34). Cette fois-ci encore il a fait une découverte et signale des rapprochements "dont aucun n'est fait par M. Barckhausen dans son édition critique des *Lettres Persanes*." Voyons de plus près quels sont ces rapprochements "Montesquieu expose longuement les théories de Mandeville sur le luxe dans la lettre CVI," ce que est en effet possible et probable;—"le système de Newton dont il fait grand éloge dans la lettre XCVII," or si l'on se reporte au texte on trouve que Montesquieu ne fait que copier la seconde loi de la nature et le 58 article de la troisième partie des *Principes de la philosophie* de Descartes. Si l'on consulte l'édition de Barckhausen on voit que l'éditeur de Montesquieu a dit: "Ce sont les principes de la physique de Descartes que Montesquieu rappelle ici" et c'est M. Barckhausen qui a raison. Enfin M. Raynaud affirme que Montesquieu explique "les idées de Locke sur le gouvernement dans la lettre CIX." Locke aurait donc dit "qu'il n'y a qu'un lien qui puisse attacher les hommes, celui de la gratitude . . . ces divers motifs de reconnaissance sont l'origine de tous les royaumes et de toutes les sociétés"; il aurait dit aussi que "le crime de lèse-majesté n'est autre chose que le crime que le plus faible commet contre le plus fort en lui désobéissant."

sant, de quelque manière qu'il lui désobéisse." M. Reynaud aurait bien dû nous dire où Locke a exposé ces théories. Ce qui me frappe au contraire est que dans une lettre où Montesquieu veut décrire le gouvernement anglais, il condamne nettement l'esprit politique qui règne en Angleterre et lui préfère en tout cas l'esprit de la monarchie française qu'il analyse dans les deux lettres précédentes. Quant à faire remonter à Collins *A discourse of free thinking*, 1713, l'origine des plaisanteries contre la trinité et l'eucharistie, c'est vraiment trop ignorer que l'on se querellait en France depuis cent cinquante ans sur la transsubstantiation et toutes les discussions sur les Ariens, sociniens et anti-trinitaires. Enfin déclarer que l'on retrouvera chez Montesquieu "la conception essentiellement morale et pratique de la religion des déistes anglais (lettre XLIV), leur affirmation que la morale peut se passer de la religion (lettre LXXXIII), leur façon de railler le Christianisme à travers un autre culte," me semble simplement démontrer de façon éclatante que Montesquieu avait lu Bayle et qu'il pouvait, sans passer le détroit, trouver en France la plupart des idées exprimées dans les *Lettres Persanes*.

Ce n'est point d'ailleurs que M. Reynaud n'ait pas fait de découvertes; les ressemblances qu'il indique entre Voltaire et Fielding en particulier valent qu'on s'y arrête. Mais, selon sa thèse même, il s'agit non pas tant de questions de détail que des principes (p. 47). C'est à cause de l'influence anglaise que Montesquieu et Voltaire "ont tué la faculté même de vénérer et de croire" (p. 45) et qu'ils ont adopté une attitude ironique, toute différente de "l'ancienne gauloiserie," qui selon M. Reynaud "s'attaquait aux hommes et non aux choses, visait les excès, non les principes," ce qui constituerait une singulière supériorité.

Les pages excellentes qu'il écrit sur l'introduction du "sensualisme" anglais sont diminuées par les mêmes erreurs que nous avons signalées plus haut et par un étrange mélange d'affirmations contestables, par exemple que "le point de vue latin de la victoire nécessaire et ennoblissante de l'esprit sur la chair n'est pas celui de Richardson." Que ce ne soit pas le point de vue de Richardson, j'y consens volontiers, mais que ce soit un point de vue exclusivement latin, c'est ce que je me refuse à croire et l'on aimerait à savoir ce qu'en aurait pensé Rabelais ou Montaigne, Molière et Lafontaine ou même Boileau et peut-être Racine. La véritable thèse de M. Reynaud apparaît à la page 75 quand il déclare :

Il existe des races distinctes et ces races ont entre elles des affinités ou des antipathies marquées comme tous les corps vivants. Ces vérités sottement combattues chez nous éclatent avec une évidence irrésistible dans les rapports intellectuels de l'Allemagne avec la France et l'Angleterre au XVIII^e siècle.

Si c'est là une vérité elle est au moins fort contestée et fort con-

testable quand il s'agit de la France et, si je ne me trompe, c'est plutôt en Allemagne et en Angleterre qu'en France que M. Reynaud a pu la voir le plus souvent exprimée.

Entre temps, et comme involontairement, l'auteur laisse d'ailleurs échapper des aveux qui ruinent sa thèse. Après nous avoir dit que la littérature anglo-germanique allait déborder sur la France et y produire "une révolution analogue à celle qui avait eu lieu dans la philosophie" (p. 83), il admet aussitôt que "d'elle-même notre littérature, dès la fin du dix-septième siècle, lorsque les idées fondamentales avaient commencé à se modifier, avait pris une direction analogue vers la *nature* et la *réalité*." Bien plus, en bien des cas, les auteurs français avaient sur ce terrain devancé les auteurs anglais;—c'est ainsi que Gil Blas est déjà un roman analogue à ceux qu'écrira plus tard Fielding. Il ne s'agit donc plus d'influences unilatérales, "les emprunts ont été réciproques." Mais ceci une fois admis, M. Reynaud l'oublie malheureusement dans le cours de sa démonstration. Je ne peux entrer dans le détail; il me sera cependant permis de citer encore un exemple des procédés de M. R. Quand il en arrive à Rousseau, il s'amuse à railler

notre école actuelle d'historiens de la littérature qui cite avec componction Elien, Plutarque, Montaigne, l'Écriture . . . va chercher les inévitables auteurs de récits de voyage . . . qui ont tout au plus fourni à Rousseau quelques misérables détails et . . . néglige complètement des ouvrages contemporains (p. 102).

Par là M. Reynaud entend surtout Locke et Pope dont en effet on ne tient pas toujours suffisamment compte; mais croit-il vraiment que Pope a été le premier à vanter "le bonheur de l'Indien qui a su rester dans l'ignorance où l'avait placé le Créateur" et que Rousseau n'aurait pu trouver cette idée ailleurs, en particulier dans les ouvrages que Rousseau lui-même cite dans les notes qu'il a mises à la fin du *Discours de l'Inégalité*?

On concédera difficilement que

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre dans les *Études de la nature* est déjà spiritualiste et chrétien. Dans *Paul et Virginie*, l'épisode qui les accompagne, il sera—peut-être à son insu d'ailleurs—catholique (p. 141).

Ce faux-bonhomme de Bernardin n'aurait peut-être pas protesté; mais il est assez amusant qu'encore aujourd'hui il se trouve quelqu'un pour se laisser prendre à ses déclarations vertueuses. Bien plus juste est l'étude sur Chateaubriand; M. Reynaud me permettra cependant de lui rappeler que l'influence de Milton sur l'auteur des *Natchez* a été signalée avant lui par Miss J. Van Ness Smead et Miss M. H. Miller dans deux études qui ont paru dans les *Johns Hopkins Studies*.

Par contre, il est difficile de laisser passer sans commentaire le parallèle qu'il établit entre l'esprit français traditionnel et l'esprit anglo-germanique:

D'un côté la "nature," la sourde vie de la sensibilité, de l'instinct, l'imagination éclatante, se plaisant au contact de la réalité, l'affirmation énergique de l'individuel. De l'autre la raison claire, absolue, humaine et non individuelle, le mépris de tout ce qui émane des profondeurs troubles de la sentimentalité, l'indifférence aux choses du réel quotidien, le besoin d'ennoblir, de grandir la réalité comme l'homme (p. 157).

Voilà une comparaison qui aurait transporté d'aise M. Nisard; mais comment M. Reynaud ne s'aperçoit-il pas qu'en parlant comme il le fait de "l'âme française," en la supposant immuable et sans doute éternelle et comme indépendante des Français eux-mêmes, il reproduit une théorie qui n'est point d'origine française et qu'à son insu il s'est laissé contaminer par le philosophisme anglo-germanique? Ce nationalisme déplacé l'amène même à déclarer dramatiquement, mais sans réussir à éveiller le moindre regret patriotique que

après *René* de nouvelles sollicitations étrangères viennent entraîner l'imagination française à un dernier assaut qui, cette fois, emportera jusqu'au réduit suprême de la résistance nationale: la tragédie classique (p. 162).

Ce n'est pas là d'ailleurs un simple lapsus; à la fin du chapitre suivant la même idée reparaît avec une métaphore différente:

Hernani triomphait. La tragédie "classique" celle des Corneille, des Racine et des Voltaire, dans lesquelles s'étaient incarnés deux siècles de littérature et de haute civilisation française, gisait définitivement effondrée. Le flot étranger qui se ruait depuis si longtemps contre ce dernier obstacle avait déferlé lui sur (p. 243).

M. Reynaud aura beau faire, il n'arrivera pas à nous faire croire que la tragédie de Voltaire est l'incarnation de "deux siècles de littérature et de haute civilisation," il a trop de goût pour le croire lui-même et pour pleurer sur l'effondrement de la tragédie de 1830.

Dans sa conclusion, après avoir résumé sa thèse, il a été forcé par l'évidence même d'admettre des restrictions telles que la thèse elle-même disparaît. Il montre fort bien qu'en fait, jamais l'esprit français

même dans sa conversion au déterminisme matérialiste et au sensualisme individualiste n'a complètement adopté le point de vue de ses initiateurs, qu'il ne s'est pas entièrement soumis aux choses et n'a pas subi, jusqu'aux limites extrêmes, la domination du réel (p. 272).

On peut se demander si, dans ces conditions, l'auteur était bien fondé à déclarer quelques pages auparavant

qu'en littérature aussi bien qu'en politique et en philosophie, c'est le génie anglo-germanique qui a régné sur le monde au XIX^e siècle par suite de l'abdication de notre culture au XVIII^e (p. 266).

Dans la littérature d'aujourd'hui enfin M. Reynaud voit surtout des influences anglaises, allemandes, scandinaves, russes ou autres qui

s'exercent toutes dans le même sens, un sens unique, celui de l'individualisme et de l'instinctivisme absolus, prolongeant ainsi très nettement celles que nous subissons depuis deux siècles (p. 281).

On voit paraître ici le but réel du livre de M. Reynaud; il a voulu avant tout adresser un appel aux jeunes écrivains pour les exhorter à travailler à la formation d'une littérature nationale. Il voudrait très nettement élever une muraille de Chine autour de la France. Il regrette le dix-septième siècle, époque ou d'après lui la balance du commerce intellectuel a été en faveur de la France et il craint que les importations étrangères ne tuent la production nationale. Il oublie que bien souvent l'étranger n'a fait que rendre à la France ce qu'elle avait prêté, que les écrivains français ont transformé, modifié et marqué à leur coin les matériaux qu'ils avaient reçus d'Italie, d'Espagne, d'Angleterre ou d'Allemagne. Il oublie que depuis le moyen âge il y a eu une littérature européenne, que la Renaissance, l'esprit du dix-huitième siècle et le romantisme sont des phénomènes européens, que le classicisme français est une sorte de miracle intellectuel où grâce à un effort de volonté et une rencontre de génies, qui ne pouvaient ni durer ni se reproduire sous la même forme, quelques hommes ont réussi à combiner "l'antiquité et le catholicisme." Il a, ce qui est profondément regrettable, apporté à l'étude de la littérature comparée un esprit de parti qui est la négation même de ce genre d'études. Il n'a pas fait œuvre d'historien. Son livre qui parfois a le ton d'un pamphlet vaut exactement ce que vaudrait un travail sur le libre échange qui serait écrit par un protectionniste obstiné.

GILBERT CHINARD.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Anatole France, the Degeneration of a Great Artist, by BARRY CERF, New York, Dial Press, 1926. xi + 303 pp.

The publishers call this book "the first comprehensive account in English of France's life and work," and Professor Cerf himself mentions only one English item, a chapter in Guérard's *Five Masters of French Romance*. This is to ignore Shanks's readable and sympathetic *Anatole France*,¹ and May's *Anatole France, the Man and his Work*,² hagiographic, yet urbane and informing. In any case it is not debatable that Mr. Cerf offers the first extensive American diatribe against the author of *Thaïs*.

¹ Chicago, Open Court, 1919.

² New York, Dodd Mead, 1924.

Like Giese in his recent *Victor Hugo*,³ Mr. Cerf attacks in the name of a doctrine which allies him with certain distinguished *humanists*, American and European. He would agree with another disciple of these, P. H. Frye, that Romanticist qualities "have infected the literature and criticism of posterity."⁴ He chooses as epigraph lines from the *Confessions* about Rousseau's "strong tendency to degenerate" (which after all might be the admission of the most austere Puritan); France's despair is "viti-ated hopelessly by Romanticist sensuality" (p. 95), his style "in-curably romantic" (p. 257). What is remarked of "the insistent note of effeminacy" (p. 263) recalls Lasserre's stricture about Romanticism as "la dévirilisation de l'homme." The author refers to "all the muddy water of discouragement and disillusion which has flowed under the bridge during the last century of Rousseau-istic experiment" (p. 59) in a tone which suggests Seillière's arraignment of the fifth Rousseauistic generation. The book is full of such reminiscences.

We get close to Mr. Cerf's essential philosophy in a passage where he writes, a little heavily, of

a reconciliation of the claims of head and heart, and a recognition of something which is neither of the head nor of the heart (something which Socrates and Marcus Aurelius called the inner voice; or perhaps even something more mysterious still) (p. 165).

It is possible to find nobility in this attitude, even to accept it as a creed (as have people so diverse as Saint Paul, certain Elizabethans, George Meredith, and François de Curel) and yet to consider Mr. Cerf an unsuccessful champion. He criticizes with such an apostolic piety! More important to humanists, he says, than all other virtues is seriousness, and he so insists that one cannot help thinking of how the good humanist Molière tempered this virtue. Details about France's private life may be mentioned by a critic about to appraise his art; Mr. Cerf merely raises such questions as Ste.-Beuve in a famous passage recommended. But Ste.-Beuve suggested that the questions be put discreetly and perhaps only to oneself; Mr. Cerf asks and answers the questions loudly and, in a severe style that it requires some tenacity to follow, tells what is wrong with France's attitude. Ste.-Beuve himself, measured chiefly by such standards, would be only a third-rate critic.

Mr. Cerf is well-read in his author and in various literatures. But when he remarks that "it is only by a half-anglicized Gallicism that we dare speak of Anatole France's intellectual sensuality," he may be reminded that one of the best definitions of the

³ New York, Dial Press, 1926.

⁴ *Romance and Tragedy*, Boston, Marshall Jones, 1922, p. 33.

dilettante, one he himself uses, came out of New England in 1867, Lowell's 'intellectual voluptuary.'⁵ It is bewildering to have Mr. Cerf quote from a preface written in 1908 to show what was France's mood in 1897 (p. 140). The critic misses a significant point about *le Procureur de Judée*, a tale on which he insists; it first appeared, not as indicated by him in *l'Étui de Nacre*, but in *le Temps* for December 25, 1891, and as a Christmas story! Since credence is given so often to Brousson, it is surprising that along with the comment on the excellence of *le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard* we do not find what Brousson reports as France's final estimate of the book: "un chef-d'œuvre de platitude."⁶ I am not persuaded that Jules Lemaître, in calling France *l'extrême fleur du génie latin*, "meant that he was the last of the Alexandrians" (p. 260); I do not read this into Lemaître's "le produit extrême et très pur de la seule tradition grecque et latine."⁷

Mr. Cerf indicates himself that he is closely following certain French critics, notably Michaut. He would accept with alacrity the recent judgment of Bernard Fay that the character of France *avait quelque chose de veule* and that he possessed *peu de courage et peu d'imagination*.⁸ If Mr. Cerf is on the side of these Frenchmen, he writes with less distinction, with less originality, and his book smacks over-strongly of the Preacher.

HORATIO SMITH.

Brown University.

Studies in Prefixes and Suffixes in Middle Scottish. By ELISABETH WESTERGAARD (Copenhagen). Oxford University Press, American Branch, N. Y., 1924. Pp. xii and 135. \$4.20.

Miss Westergaard's monograph is devoted to a subject and a thesis. Her subject is a study of the suffixes and prefixes of whatever origin (inflectional endings excepted; cf. p. 12, n. 1) in Middle Scots. Her thesis is more difficult to state, but if I understand aright, it is that a word or type of word used by the 'makaris' is to be regarded as artificial and not a part of the spoken language of the day unless this same word be found in OE. or the modern Scottish dialect(s). In respect to word-formation modern Scottish is shown to be more conservative (with reference to OE. and ME.) than is the Standard.

In the introduction are discussed the rise and fall of the Middle-Scots literary language and the function and influence of prefixes

⁵ *Works*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, II, 253.

⁶ *A. F. en Pantoufles*, p. 179.

⁷ *Les Contemporains*, II, 114.

⁸ *Les Nouvelles Littéraires*, 21 Août, 1926.

and suffixes. There follows a series of nine chapters on Germanic prefixes and suffixes, Romanic prefixes and suffixes, 'masked' Germanic suffixes, aphetic forms *vs.* the loss of suffix, and the conversion of dialect words; to certain verbal suffixes a special chapter is given. By 'masked' Germanic suffixes are meant such Germanic suffixes as by popular (or better 'learned') etymology have been adapted to some similar suffix of Romanic origin, e. g. *emptive* for *empty*.

The author has gathered in her little volume extensive and interesting collectanea drawn from an adequate canvas of representative Middle-Scots and modern Scottish literary works and dictionaries. Mätzner's *Wörterbuch* to his *Altenglische Sprachproben* does not appear to have been utilized for ME. material. The careful reader will extract much valuable information from this monograph, but the merits of the work are all too often obscured by lack of clarity of statement and simplicity of arrangement. In a revised or extended edition of this book attention should be given to the following points: (1) a more adequate (though brief) historical introduction to the compounding elements; (2) a freer glossing of, or provision of etymologies to, the words cited; (3) a more extensive use of quotation with translation where necessary—this last would save many explanations; (4) the use and citation of current studies which deal with details of the subject. For the prefix *be-* (pp. 18-21), for example, reference to J. Lenze's Kiel diss. (1909), *Das praefix 'bi' in der ae. nominal- und verbalkomposition* would be more useful than F. Tamm's *Om tyska Prefix i Svenskan* (Upsala, 1876). A whole series of Kiel dissertations on OE. word-formation are passed over and many other studies on OE. and ME. prefixes and suffixes. Reference to the *NED.* as *OED.* and to the *EDD.* as '*Wright*' further suggests a lack of familiarity with current practice.

Miss Westergaard succeeds in exhibiting the conservative character of mod. Scottish in word-formation, but her generalization that word-formations used by the 'makaris' and not found in OE. or in mod. Scottish were purely artificial and did not enter the spoken language of cultured persons cannot be admitted as a universal principle. There is, of course, no question as to the general 'ink-horn' character of Middle-Scots poetic diction, but we must remember that words change fashion in speech as well as in books. If the Standard had suffered in the mid-seventeenth century as did Scots, the application of Miss Westergaard's methods to the language of the Elizabethans would lead to curious conclusions as to the speech of Shakspeare and his fellows.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Cambridge, Mass.

Guy de Maupassant. Von HEINRICH GELZER. Heidelberg, 1926.
Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher. II.
Reihe: Literaturgeschichte, 204 + 4 pp.

Appearing in a series of *Elementar- und Handbücher*, this book makes no pretense to being other than an interpretation of Maupassant to the German public. His popularity in Germany is testified to by large editions and frequent translations. A brief sketch of his life is followed by a consideration of his literary origins and activities, critical résumés of his works, accompanied by discussion of his style, and a chapter on his personality. The presentation as a whole is adequate for its purpose, clear and readable, though the style is marred by the very frequent use of words of French origin (*respektabel, diffizil, der Mondain*, etc.) where the German term would be preferable.

The chapter on Maupassant's personality brings some interesting compilations of data from his writings: the musicians and works of art he preferred, the poems he quotes, the favorite readings of his characters, his political views, etc. In the discussion of his style two peculiarities of technique are pointed out with a wealth of examples. These are the accentuation of a word by its repetition and the use of the *Dreiklang* (*la triade*), often a combination of the two: (*Une Vie*) *C'est là que . . . , c'est là qu'il . . . , c'est aussi là qu'elle . . . ; les jours . . . , ces jours . . . , ces jours . . . ; la mer . . . , la mer . . . , la mer . . . ; (L'Héritage) sur ses goûts, sur ses rêves, sur ses plaisirs; sautait, bouillonnait, écumait; le bousculant, le secouant, le bourrant*, etc. The use of the *triade* is not uncommon in French; it is found, according to Mr. Gelzer, in Rousseau, Catulle Mendès, Zola, Barbusse, occasionally in Flaubert, but its overfrequent use in Maupassant he finds has a monotonous and tiring effect.

Some of Mr. Melzer's judgments are worth noting, as running counter to the generally accepted views. Much is said of Maupassant's triviality and sentimentality, characterized (p. 135) as "sweetish" (p. 115), as "oily and shallow"; the style of *Notre Cœur* is qualified as "perfumed" (p. 134); a group of stories (*Le Baptême, Petit Soldat*, etc.) are termed (p. 89) *Gartenlaubgeschichten* (*à l'eau de rose*). These are questions of personal reaction, not susceptible of proof. Mr. Gelzer's theories as to Maupassant's literary genesis are, however, decidedly dubious. While conceding, necessarily, Flaubert's influence on Maupassant's career, he rates this influence on the formation of the artist as superficial, a "slight whitewash" (pp. 14, 26). Flaubert's fanatical devotion to his art is called a mere pose with Maupassant, who admires but cannot imitate Flaubert's objectivity and impersonality and the thoroughness of his hatred of the bourgeois. Maupassant loved and revered the great artist but was never pene-

trated with his ideas, never struggled to attain his art. Mr. Gelzer's proofs of the above are far from adequate and he dismisses with the remark "in theory but not in practice" Maupassant's own statement (quoted p. 187) "Whenever I think I have forgotten my trade as an author I read Flaubert again. He is the master, the true master." A real kinship is found, however, to exist between Maupassant and Octave Feuillet. This likeness is based on some outward resemblances of style, on the fundamental "sentimentality" of both, on the inclusion (*preface to Pierre et Jean*), of *M. de Camors* in a list of important novels, and on a couple of references to Feuillet. The first of these is inconclusive, and as for the second, does not *une espèce de pastiche de la manière élégante de Feuillet et Cie* express sarcasm rather than admiration?

Goucher College.

EUNICE R. GODDARD.

Le Rôle du surnaturel dans les chansons de geste. Par ADOLPHE JACQUES DICKMAN. Paris: Champion, 1926. Pp. xii + 208.

La Croyance à la magie au XVIIIe siècle en France dans les contes, romans et traités. Par CONSTANTIN BILA. Paris: Gamber, 1925. Pp. 158.

The two books under review, written by American modern language men and published in France, discuss different phases of the marvelous element in French literature.¹ Dr. Dickman's study, which is an Iowa University dissertation, deals, as the title shows, with the rôle of the supernatural in the *chansons de geste*. The author distinguishes two sorts of supernatural: the marvelous and the religious or Christian supernatural. Under the first term

¹ Dr. Williams' book, *The Merveilleux in the Epic*, equally recently published in France, would have been grouped in this review together with these two studies if it had not already been competently reviewed in the December, 1926, number of this journal. We will only mention that the title is a misnomer inasmuch as the book deals exclusively with the theoretical discussion of the employment of the marvelous in epic poetry and is a recapitulation of the controversy waged in France throughout the classical period between the champions of the Christian supernatural and the protagonists of pagan mythology. The book should have been named "The Theory of the Merveilleux in the French Epic during the Classical Period," for the first brief chapter devoted to the marvelous in antiquity does not warrant the omission of the word "French" from the title. It is furthermore to be regretted that the author has failed to consult several important recent studies on the subject, such as Hubert Matthey's Geneva thesis *Essai sur le merveilleux dans la littérature française depuis 1800* (Paris, 1915) and the present writer's booklet *Supernaturalism and Satanism in Chateaubriand* (Chicago, 1922), both of which repeatedly refer back to the classical quarrel in regard to the Christian supernatural.

he understands all sorts of feats which surpass our natural capacities. The second is reserved for the direct intervention in human affairs of extra-human agents, the Lord with his angels on the one hand, and the Devil with his imps, on the other. The content of both sorts of supernatural in all the medieval epics thus far published and analyzed by the author is contained in the Index (thirty-three pages). After a thorough discussion of the subject, Dr. Dickman himself comes to the conclusion that the supernatural does not after all play a very important part in the *chansons de geste*. The moderation of this poetic *genre* in regard to the marvelous, in contrast to all other forms of medieval literature, is one of its chief characteristics. The employment of the supernatural in the medieval epics apparently is, as the author suggests, a concession on the part of the poets to popular liking for prodigies. Dr. Dickman would have found a far more fruitful field for his investigation if he had carried it on in any other form of medieval literature. We can, of course, have no quarrel with a man in regard to the choice of his subject. But what the author owes us, indeed, is an explanation of why he has chosen a subject for his thesis which had been treated only eight years before. He lists Miss Margaret Hollauer's Basle dissertation, which bears almost the very same title as his own,² without saying a word as to the reasons which prompted him to do the work over again. The reviewer has not read the Swiss thesis and cannot tell whether or not it sufficiently covers the field. The fact that Miss Hollauer's book is written in German does not warrant a duplication in French. An explanation is necessary on the part of the author of the later thesis. He has failed to offer it. Dr. Dickman's book is far above the average American thesis in the modern language field. But it must be admitted that it suffers first of all from prolixity. The second of the five parts, into which the book is divided, containing brief résumés of the poems under discussion, is superfluous in a dissertation, which is not intended for the lay reader. The book contains other faults of composition. It would indeed be well if the men at our universities who direct the writing of doctoral dissertations would pay more attention to the form in which they are presented. The first part of the book, containing two chapters entitled respectively Introduction and Definitions, belongs wholly in the Introduction. It is in fact just as peculiar to see the Introduction as part of the book proper as to find the Index called Part V. Yet it should be said that the book is inter-

The value of the book is considerably lessened by its lack of an index. In all likelihood, Dr. Williams rushed his book into print without giving it time to "ripen" under his hands.

² Margaret Hollauer, *Das wunderbare Element in den chansons de geste*. Basel, 1918.

esting as well as informing. The subject is presented in a clear and efficient manner.

Dr. Bila's thesis belongs to *Kulturgeschichte* rather than to *Literaturgeschichte*. It deals with the belief in magic, which was so prevalent in the eighteenth century, the century of a Voltaire and a Diderot. Notwithstanding its subtitle, we find no discussion of the element of magic in the well-known fictional writings of the period. The chapter VI, twenty-three small pages long, deals almost exclusively with such works as Montfaucon de Villars' *Comte de Gabalis* and Bordelon's *Histoire . . . de M. Oufle* known only to literary historians. The author refers with but a few words to Le Sage's *le Diable boiteux* and Cazotte's *le Diable amoureux*, the two outstanding "magical" novels of that period. The book bespeaks for its author maturity of mind and liberality of spirit. As a theologian he was well qualified to deal with the subject, but he has failed to do it justice. The book is disappointing in subject-matter as it is displeasing in its mechanical aspect. It will certainly not do credit in this country to the doctorat de l'Université de Paris.

Baker University.

MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN.

A Dictionary of Modern English Usage, by H. W. FOWLER. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1926. Pp. viii + 742. \$3.00.

Mr. Fowler's latest volume has grown naturally out of his earlier work as editor of dictionaries and author of various treatises on English usage. He reveals himself, in the work under review, as master of his material and delightful in its presentation. The book is eminently readable. It swarms with "general articles" having seductive titles like *Cannibalism*, *Malaprops*, *Superiority*, *Unequal Yokefellows*, etc., and if the reader turns to any of these and begins to read, he will not stop till he comes to the end. Yet nowadays we make great demands on an author of an authoritative work on any subject. It is not enough that he have his material well in hand and agreeably set forth. We expect him to be trained in scientific method, and dominated by the scientific point of view. Now in Mr. Fowler's chosen field of activity, viz., linguistic science, sound and abiding work cannot be done by a man weak in phonetics and neglectful of the historical approach to the problems of which he writes. And Mr. Fowler, unfortunately enough, cannot well be denied both weakness in phonetics and neglect of history. At bottom his book is unsound. It gives us the conclusions of a learned and charming dilettante rather than those of a man of science. It is a collection of linguistic prejudices

persuasively presented by a clever advocate; it is not an objective, scientific presentation of the facts of English usage.

It would be easy to cover many pages with illustrations of the deficiencies of Mr. Fowler as a man of science. I will confine myself, however, to one illustration, chosen by opening the book at random. The author writes as follows on the word *Canaan*:

The prevalent pronunciation is undoubtedly *kānyan*, and this is a quite justifiable escape from the difficult and unEnglish *kāna-an*; *kāna-an* passes into *kānyan*, and that into *kānyan*; the pronunciation *kānan*, alone recognized by the OED, but chiefly in clerical use, is a worse evasion of the same difficulty.

After such an example, comment on Mr. Fowler's knowledge of phonetics and historical grammar is hardly needed, and the unscientific tone of his work is sufficiently obvious. Mr. Fowler's volume belongs rather with books like Mr. Mencken's *American Language* than with works of exact scholarship. But when I say this, I am not condemning the book. On the contrary, I am praising it. Grammarians and layman alike ought to have it on their shelves, and if they fail to find it highly enjoyable and highly stimulating, there is something wrong with them.

The Johns Hopkins University.

KEMP MALONE.

Beowulf, translated into English verse with an introduction, notes and appendices, by D. H. CRAWFORD. Vol. XXVII of *The Medieval Library*, under the general editorship of Sir ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. Chatto and Windus, London, 1926. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York. \$1.85.

The translator has given us an agreeable, and, on the whole, a faithful rendering of the Old English epic into modern English verse. While I have not made a complete line-by-line comparison of text and translation, I have noted but few departures from the usual interpretation of the text like 'sons' for *sunu* (v. 1115). Occasionally a stylistic point is missed, with unfortunate effect, as the variation *Geotena leode | mægen Hreðmanna* (vv. 443-445) 'people of the Geats' (acc. + gen.) | 'host of the Hreðmen' (acc. + gen.). The failure to apply in this case the stylistic principles of OE epic variation leads the translator to interpret *Hreðmen* as 'Danes' (p. 155)! The same tendency to overlook epic variation is no doubt ultimately responsible for the denaturing of the sword-name *Hunlaving* (v. 1143) into 'son of Hunlaf,' although here the translator has many fellows in sin. The variation *wind | lað gewidru* (vv. 1374-1375) likewise escapes notice, with unhappy effects on the translation. See E. A. Kock, *Anglia*, XLV,

118. In the Index of Proper Names we find the Scandian form of the name given now and then, whether in Saxonian or Icelandic shape. It would have been well to do this systematically. The use of the German form *Schonen* for the name of the Swedish province Skåne is unfortunate, in my opinion. Either the Beowulfian *Scedenig* or the Danish *Skaane* would be preferable, if typographical difficulties precluded the use of the Swedish form. In general, the Scandian material is not taken sufficiently into account. Thus, the *Bjarkarímur* is not mentioned on p. 134, and under *Wylfings* (p. 160) we learn of the retainers of Dietrich von Bern but not of Helgi or Hjörvarðr ylfingr. Various statements in the notes (pp. 121-133) are open to challenge. Thus, the emendation of *para* to *wāran* in v. 1015 is by no means certain (see Kock, *Anglia*, XLVI, 77). Again, there is nothing "highly improbable" in the assumption that, after the fall of Hroðulf, Beowulf ruled over the Danes (see my *Literary History of Hamlet*, I, 93 ff.). But in spite of these and other faults of detail, the book as a whole is distinctly to be commended.

KEMP MALONE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Hamburgische Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Philologie, herausgegeben von CONRAD BORCHLING, ROBERT PETSCH, AGATHE LASCH. Dortmund. Fr. Wilh. Ruhfus. Reihe I. Texte:

1. *Das Landrecht des Sachsenspiegels, nach der Bremer Handschrift von 1342*, hrsg. von CONRAD BORCHLING. Dortmund, 1925. Pp. xxix, 94.
2. *Aus alten niederdeutschen Stadtbüchern. Ein mittelniederdeutsches Lesebuch*, hrsg. von AGATHE LASCH. Dortmund, 1925. Pp. ix, 165.

These first two volumes published by two of the editors of this new series are what we would expect from such well known specialists in the field of Low German. They are exceedingly well executed and especially welcome at this time when Middle Low German is beginning to claim its rightful place as a subject of thorough study in Germanic Philology.

The first volume replaces the edition of the Bremen ms. of the *Sachsenspiegel* by Homeyer,—not the complete Homeyer, however—which has long been out of print. A valuable introduction gives a minute description of this ms. and the newly found Brunswick fragments, which in their language are closer to that of Eike's, and a characterization of their dialects. Inserted between the intro-

duction and the text are photostatic copies of a page of the Bremen ms. and a page of the *Braunschweiger Bruchstücke*. As to the text itself, only the Brunswick fragments in the appendix are reproduced in the exact reading of the ms. In the Bremen text all abbreviations are resolved, and words or phrases inserted to make it readable.

The second volume is a Middle Low German Reader—a splendid supplement to W. Stammler's *Lesebuch*, which contains only literary selections—offering a most varied collection of statutes, letters, deeds, and other legal documents, very carefully chosen as well for their intrinsic historical and cultural value, as also for their linguistic importance. The latter being of course the main purpose of the book, for it is primarily an introduction to the study of Middle Low German dialects. The selections illustrating these various dialects are chronologically arranged and given in the exact manuscript readings, with only the abbreviations resolved and palpable mistakes corrected. The following cities and towns with their respective dialects are represented: 1. Bremen, Lüneburg, Garz, Danzig, and Groningen as types of *nordniedersächsisch*; 2. Berlin, Halle, and Aken as types of *elbstfälisch*; 3. Braunschweig, as *ostfälisch*; 4. Minden, Werl, Coesfeld, as types of *westfälisch*.

Following the text are fifty pages of valuable notes mainly of a linguistic character, and a short list of words which are either not found at all in the Schiller-Lübben (and Walther) *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch*, or not with the particular meaning in the selections. This *Wortverzeichnis* is the unsatisfactory part of the book from the student's standpoint. The only handy dictionary is the *Mittelniederdeutsches Handwörterbuch* of Christoph Walther, Norden u. Leipzig, 1888, and is out of print and difficult to procure. The large Schiller-Lübben is also out of print and besides is not nearly as complete as the small Walther. A glossary, such as that appended to Weiske's edition of the Leipzig ms. of the *Sachsenspiegel* by R. Hildebrand, which happily may in a way also serve the student using the Borchling edition, would materially enhance the value of the book.

EDWARD H. SEHRT.

George Washington University.

America in Imaginative German Literature in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century. By PAUL C. WEBER. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. xv + 301 pp.

In this Columbia doctoral thesis Paul Weber has given us by far the fullest and most authoritative treatment of a subject which possesses both a live interest and a real significance. Proceeding from his comparatively narrow original purpose of investigating

the presentation of America in the works of Sealsfield-Postl, the writer has broadened the scope of his work to such an extent that it has required ten years and over three hundred pages to arrive at and set forth the results. They are important enough to merit this amount of time and space.

The opening chapter, entitled "The Awakening of Interest in America in German Literature from 1775 to 1800," shows how the American Revolution first aroused German curiosity and interest in America and how this interest was nourished by a wealth of scientific and descriptive writings, glowing at first with a Roussellian enthusiasm, but then, as the century waned, dying down to a troubled censoriousness born of the realization that the New World was still woefully lacking in culture and ideals. The author does not say so, but it is a fact that right here, in the eighteenth century, we have the two poles between which the pendulum will swing throughout the entire period under discussion.

The "Era of Romanticism" which follows reveals a certain apathy toward the fascinating historical development of the United States and toward conditions prevailing there, but shows all the greater interest in the ideals of the Republic and in its possibilities as a haven for the many *Europamüden*. The attendant conception of the American Indian as an uncouth but kindly son of the wilderness, the hapless victim and prey of the civilized European invader, a conception so well exemplified by Seume's much quoted "wir Wilden sind doch bess're Menschen," follows as a natural consequence. The author is wise in stressing the fact that the German romantic attitude toward America may well have taken its light and leading from French and English sources, for of course France and England woke up to America much earlier than Germany did.

The "Travel Literature" which is next discussed, is of a more personal nature and deserves consideration primarily as paving the way for the emigration literature which followed later. The importance of the "Ethnographical Novels," represented chiefly by Sealsfield and Gerstäcker, in outlining on the whole a clear picture of actual American conditions for German readers, is recognized. In his discussion of Sealsfield the author is naturally unable to go far beyond what Uhlendorf has said in his painstaking study published in vols. xx-xxi of the *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter*.

In the "Austrian Writers" other than Sealsfield—Feuchtersleben, Lenau, Grün, Stifter and Grillparzer—we find a variety of opinion, which the author tries in vain to epitomize in a few sentences. For Feuchtersleben the political aspect is predominant, for Grün country life and nature. Lenau, about whose stay in America all the facts and documents are not yet known in spite of frequent treatment, is the disillusioned idealist, and Stifter the enthusiastic romanticist. Grillparzer finally is the benevolent realist.

Those writers whom the author calls Romantic-Realistic, chiefly Alexis and the superficial Freiligrath, prepare us for the so called "Emigration Literature" of Willkomm, Hoffmann von Fallersleben and Auerbach. In all these men there is a strong tendency to turn from nebulous, ill-informed romanticism to realities. Willkomm's *Europamäiden* and Hoffmann von Fallersleben's *Texanische Lieder* are appraised as the most valuable works of this period from the point of view of the subject under discussion. The treatment of Menzel might just as well have been postponed to the next and last chapter on "Young Germany," for Menzel is quite at one with that group in his scathing arraignment of the American boorishness of his day, with all the vices which accompanied it.

The dissertation almost suffers from an excess of summarizing. Not only does each chapter contain a summary, but the Conclusion sums up the results once more and casts a hasty glance at the period after 1850. The eighteen-page bibliography is practically complete, except for periodical literature.

In view of the vast amount of ground and material covered, the author has performed a remarkably complete and convincing piece of work. It is very unlikely that succeeding scholars will be able to do much more than fill in or correct details. Of such details the author has several, but he ventures to offer only one on this occasion. He hopes, however, to supplement this material in another place.

In conjunction with the Erhard letter of 1794 to George Washington it would certainly have paid to discuss also the *Schreiben eines deutschen Juden an den amerikanischen Präsidenten O***. Herausgegeben von Moses Mendelssohn, Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1787 (23 pp.). This pamphlet, an appeal for a land-grant to the German Jews, which will be published and discussed by the reviewer in a forthcoming number of the *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter*, is even more significant for early German interest in America than such purely theoretical eulogies as are contained in Erhard's letter.

Finally the reviewer is inclined to put more stock than the author in Young Germany's criticism of American mercantilism, materialism and rusticity. He questions also the author's statement (p. 277) that the United States found a "worthy and honorable place in German literature" at the end of the nineteenth century. In fact is it not reasonable to say that the stark ignorance of America and Americans displayed by German writers at that time was appalling? We may question too the appropriateness of listing in a catalogue of worthy students of America such men as Liliencron, who soon departed in disgust, Wolzogen, who came with a snicker and left with a sneer, and Herzog, whose *Grosses Heimweh* is a veritable comedy of errors and distortion.

It is true, however, that now after the World War the ground in Germany is better prepared than ever for a real understanding.

A disturbing misprint is found on page 200; surely Charleston, S. C. (not N. C.) is meant.

As for publishing the results of his work in the field of non-imaginative literature, the reviewer believes that the author would do well to refrain, unless he were certain that new or greatly diverging conclusions would follow. This is hardly likely, however, for in a case like this the imaginative literature is almost sure to be a true reflection of the spirit of the non-imaginative writings, in addition to having the saving grace of imagination.

University of Cincinnati.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Die Wesensbestimmung der deutschen Romantik. Eine Einführung in die moderne Literaturwissenschaft. Von JULIUS PETERSEN. Leipzig, Quelle u. Meyer, 1926. 185 pp.

Taking as its point of vantage German Romanticism, which has busied recent investigators to such an extent that contemporary German "*Literaturgeschichte*" is all but synonymous with "*Romantikforschung*," this treatise undertakes a survey and critique of the various tendencies in modern literary scholarship, and concludes with an attempt to unite these divergent rays into a steady light by which further investigation may be profitably pursued.

After an introductory chapter in which general account is taken of the present status of literary science, five chapters are devoted to as many schools of scholarship, which might be described as: 1) the "territorial" school, associated with the names of Sauer, Nadler und Stefansky; 2) the "philosophical" (e. g. Unger, Korff); 3) the "aesthetic" (e. g. Wölfflin, Strich, Walzel); 4) the "social" (e. g. Lamprecht, Francke, Brüggemann); 5) the "generational" (e. g. Dilthey, Haym). The final chapter essays, in a "three-dimensional" method, an original synthesis of previous methods, and shows the ultimate aim and value of the book to be less negative and critical than positive and constructive. The appended bibliography of works discussed in the text indicates impressively the scope of the author's investigation.

Petersen's work is an informative and stimulating introduction to modern literary science. It shows the same robustness of principle which marked his *Literaturgeschichte als Wissenschaft* (Heidelberg, 1914). Its style is crisp, clear and interesting; its

judgments are sane and fair, and constitute truly productive criticism. To anyone who has penetrated the hollow allurements of writings of the newest "metaphysical" school, it is refreshing and reassuring to learn that sound doctrine can still be cast into such pleasing form.

WALTER SILZ.

Harvard University.

A Vocabulary of the Anglo-Manx Dialect. Compiled by A. W. MOORE, C. V. O., M. A., with the coöperation of SOPHIA MORRISON and EDMUND GOODWIN. Oxford University Press, 1924. Pp. xii, 206.

On September 8, 1909, Mr. Moore wrote to Mr. Goodwin that he had for some time been contemplating a book on the Anglo-Manx dialect, and had been compiling "a list of Anglo-Manx words and phrases in addition to those in Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*."¹ The present book represents that list as it had developed up to the time of Moore's death in November, 1909. As indicated, the volume is intended as a supplement to the great *Dialect Dictionary*. There are in the volume ca. 3,000 words not (discovered and) recorded in Wright. Of philological commentary there is but a minimum; however, the folk-lore contained in many of the discussions of the use of words is of great interest and value. It is a fine contribution to English philology to have been made by a lover of his dialect and a student of English. I am inclined to think that harvests equally rich can (if done soon) be reaped in many another peripheral dialect region of the British Isles, as The Hebrides and the islands of Western Scotland in general, Caithness and Sutherland, above all in the Orkneys, and perhaps in Wales, and Northern Ireland. Mr. Moore's death cut short the work of collecting; and it unfortunately also deprived us of much additional material that the compiler had intended to prepare, and other material to be prepared by others. The plans in regard to this are most fully set out in a letter of Oct. 8, written to his collaborator Miss Morrison. There were to be chapters on the origin of Anglo-Manx; there were to be articles on certain classes of words, 'swear-words, terms of endearment, etc.'; the Manx Fisherman, the Farmer and the Housewife, were to be presented with their occupational vocabulary; there was to be an Anglo-Manx Phonology (by Mr. Goodwin); Miss Morrison was to write a chapter on Manx Customs and Superstitions. And from the

¹ Introduction, p. v.

letter of June 8, 1909, we gather that there was to have been considerable attention paid to the Gaelic element in the vocabulary. We hope that some of these contributions may hereafter be supplied by other scholars.* As for the item of June 8, a reliable discussion of the sources of the Celtic element in the present vocabulary would have enhanced greatly the value of the book, and we regret its absence.†

Tested by phonology and peculiarities of word-usage Anglo-Manx is most closely related to the dialect of South-West Lancashire.‡ But possibly North Lancashire-West Yorkshire has contributed almost as large a share toward the character of Anglo-Manx; in his examination of his material as regards words and phrases, Moore found that Yorkshire parallels 'easily head the list.' The Isle of Man lies opposite Cumberland and North Lancashire, so that is perhaps what we should expect. But, no doubt, in recent times South Lancashire (with Liverpool) has been the main influence.

Characterizing the dialect in a few words I would say, that it would seem to show 1, an extensive Gaelic element in the vocabulary; 2, otherwise mainly native English words with Lancashire-Yorkshire affinities; 3, a moderate Norse element; 4, a small French element; 5, scattering elements of other origin; 6, numerous idioms of Gaelic origin, and prepositional constructions of the same origin; 7, many examples of archaic English usage, and inflexion; 8, many special developments in the grammar where analogy has operated to produce non-standard forms; 9, in general much word-contraction and word-reduction, as one would expect in a Celtic-colored dialect; 10, many picturesque phrases and characterizations; 11, numerous slang terms and other 'dialect' forms that are current in most parts of the United States; finally, 12, a considerable body of noa-words (connected with taboo practices).

I shall note briefly examples of a few of these.

at is used for 'of.' Sometimes this is OE *æt*, and a few times ON *at*. But in such a case as 'a house at him, maybe ten stories high' (a house of his, etc.), it is Manx Gaelic *ec*, 'at,' which with the vb, 'to be' denotes possession (p. 6). However, on this page, the Editor lists 13 uses of *at*, and the discussion seems to carry the idea that they are all of Gaelic source, though probably this is not the intention. However I am certain they are not, and that only those of the type of the one quoted are of Gaelic origin (hence numbers 2 and 4 only, plus type 5, quoted). Under characteristic 7

* Miss Morrison has since died; the intended chapter on Manx customs did not appear among the papers left.

† Mr. Goodwin supplies to the present volume a brief phonological introduction, and gives the transcriptions through the volume.

‡ Introduction, p. x.

above I shall note that the form *amn*, 'am not,' is quite clearly (Northern) Old English *am ne*. For 'children' the old plural *childer* survives by the side of *childhern* (t/fildern and t/filden). Here belong also some instances of verbs whose stem ends in a dental, and that do not take *-ed*, *-et*, in the past prtc. Under characteristic 3 I shall cite the word *sling*, 'to loiter,' which is evidently the ON *slengva*, 'to sling.' Likewise here belongs the word *scowte* (now obsolete, we are told), 'a small boat,' which is Olcel *skúta*, 'a small craft,' modn. Norw. *skute*, do. Under characteristic 8 may be noted *brenth*, 'breadth,' and *winth*, 'width'; these seem to be, not nasalizations of the vowel before *dth*, but are apparently merely analogical *n*-forms, due to the word *length*, which in Anglo-Manx is pronounced *lenth*; the direction of the analogy was then due to the frequency of the couplet 'length and breadth,' the *n* being carried over into the second word (as a dittograph in scribal errors). It is possible, however, that in 'breadth' and 'width' the *d* has been nasalized between the vowel and the (voiceless) dental. In the word 'altogether,' a later sound has apparently been anticipated in the pronunciation *pldagada(r)*, by the side of *pltagada(r)*. The verb 'choose' has a wk. pprtc. *chised* (t/fàist);* the vb. 'give (giv)' has the pprtc. *gōv* (change from the 5th to the 4th ablaut class), but apparently only in a special sense (*gove to fighting*, 'given to fighting'). Of word-contractions and reductions may be noted *bumbee*, 'bumblebee,' *forster*, 'forester,' and *dungle*, 'dung-hill.' Under number 12 I shall mention that the word 'dog' (regularly used on land) is not uttered at sea but instead one says *coill*, from Manx *quallian*, 'a pup'; there are many other 'sea-names.'

A very unusual phonological feature may finally be noted. One has the form *lemme*, 'let me'; but in the other persons this becomes: *lerrim*, 'let him'; *lerrer*, 'let her'; *lerrit*, 'let it,' and *lerrus*, 'let us'; because intervocalic *t*, or *tt*, or *th*, and sometimes *d* very often becomes *rr*.* Hence also 'Kitty' has become *Kerree*; 'out of' = *orrov*; 'about him' = *aburrim*; and 'whatever' = *wharraver*.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Illinois.

*à like α in French *pas* (Introd., p. xii).

*It appears to me that in words that have sentence stress the intervocalic *t* or *tt* remains at the stage *tp*. Thus the steps are *t(tt) > tp > rr*.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

GERMAN

Appel, Paul.—Die Schilderung der körperlichen Erscheinung des Menschen im deutschen Roman zwischen 1870-1900. Diss.-Auszug. *Giessen*: 1924. 30 pp.

Backhof, Fritz.—Schillers "Don Carlos" und das Problem der Leidenschaft. Diss. *Erlangen*: 1925. 76 pp.

Behrendt, Leo.—The Ethical Teaching of Hugo of Timberg. Diss. [Catholic Univ. Studies in German, No. 1]. *Washington, D. C.*: Catholic Univ., 1926. vii, 61 pp.

Belli, A.—Pensiero ed opere letterarie di Volfango Goethe. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1926. viii + 357 pp. L. 18.

Bodmer, Friedr.—Studien zum Dialog in Lessings Nathan. Diss. *Zürich*: 1924. 44 pp.

Collitz, Klara H.—Register zu Band 1-50, Paul und Braunes Beiträge. [SA aus PBB. 50, 3]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. 50 pp.

Dang, A. O. H.—Die kritischen Beiwörter in der literar. Kritik im 18. Jh. Diss.-Auszug. *Giessen*: 1924. 18 pp.

Eck, Else v.—Die Literaturkritik in den Hallischen u. Deutschen Jahrbüchern. (1838-1842). Diss. *München*: 1926.

Eckler, Cecilie.—Der Monolog im älteren mhd. Epos. Diss.-Auszug. *Giessen*: 1924. 24 pp.

Eichholz, Herm. — Die Zusammenbildungen im Mittel- u. Neuhochdeutschen. Diss.-Auszug. *Giessen*: 1924. 7 pp.

Essel, Karl.—Ueber Gottfried Kellers "Sinnegedicht." Eine Untersuchung. [Prager deutsche Studien. H. 40]. *Reichenberg i. B.*: F. Kraus, 1926. 56 pp. M. 2.20.

Göttweiger Trojanerkrieg, Der.—(Throyer büch). Hrsg. v. Alfred Koppitz. [Deu. Texte des MA. Bd. 29]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1926. xxviii, 483 pp. M. 33.

Grimm, Brüder.—Märchen. Aus dem Nachlass Clemens Brentanos in der Urgestalt hrsg. von Jos. Lefftz. *Leipzig*: Wolkenwanderer-Verl. 1926. 180 pp. M. 10.

Hagboldt, P., and F. W. Kaufmann.—A Modern German Grammar. Minimum Essentials Inductively Presented. *Chicago*: Univ. of Chicago Press [1927]. xiv, 192 pp.

—Inductive Readings in German. Book I. *Chicago*: Univ. of Chicago Press [1927]. xi, 107 pp. \$1.25.

Henrad, Br.—Ernst Aug. Hagen in seinen Beziehungen zur schönen Lit. Diss. *Königsberg*: 1926. 90 pp.

Hensing, Erwin.—Jüngstdeutsche Dichter in ihren Beziehungen zu J. M. R. Lenz. Diss. *München*: 1926. 117 pp.

Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur. Hrsg. v. d. Literaturarchiv-Ges. in Berlin. N. F. Bd. 4. Bibliographie 1924. *Berlin*: de Gruyter & Co., 1926. xii, 171 pp. M. 15.

Kannengiesser, J. K.—Die Sturmjahre 1848 u. 1849 und die politische Lyrik in Westfalen. Diss. *Münster*: 1923. 125 pp.

Kapff, Rud.—Schwäbische - Geschlechtnamen. Geschichtl. u. sprachl. erläutert. [Schwäbische Volkskunde. Buch 3]. *Stuttgart*: Silberburg, 1927. 145 pp. M. 3.50.

Kenngott, A.—Kleine Geschichten. *Milwaukee*: Bruce Publ. Co. [1924]. 175 pp. \$1.00.

Kinscherf, Clara.—Die Technik der Novellendichtung bei Ferd. v. Saar. Diss. *München*: 1926.

Koch, Max.—Die Flurnamen der Gemarkung Thayngen im Kanton Schaffhausen. Ein Beitr. zur Flurnamenkunde u. zur Dialektgeographie [Sprache u. Dichtung. H. 35]. *Bern*: P. Haupt, 1926. 203 pp. M. 6.40.

Kraushaar, H.—Die Syntax des Partizips bei Luther. Diss.-Auszug. *Giessen*: 1924. 13 pp.

Kunkel, Georg.—Die Darstellung körperlicher Krankheit im deutschen Drama seit Lessing. Diss. *München*: 1926.

Kuthe, Olga.—Heinrich Laubes Roman "Die Krieger" im Zusammenhang mit der Polenbegeisterung um 1830. Diss. *Marienburg*: 1925. 108 pp.

Lehnert, Aloys.—Studien zur Dialektgeographie des Kreises Saarlouis. [Rhein. Beitr. u. Hülfsbücher zur germ. Phil. u. Volkskunde. Bd. 12]. *Bonn*: F. Klopp, 1926. xii, 278 pp. M. 12.

Lessing-Buch.—Zur Zwanzigjahrfeier d. Begründung d. Lessing-Museums hrsg. v. Jos. Jellinek u. P. A. Merbach. *Berlin*: Mittler & Sohn, 1926. iv, 103 pp. M. 5.

Liebrich, Fritz.—J. P. Hebel und Basel. *Basel*: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1926. 132 pp. M. 3.

Liptzin, Solomon.—The Weavers in German Literature. [Hesperia, No. 16]. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1926. 108 pp. \$1.00.

Littmann, Arnold.—Schillers Geschichtsphilosophie. Diss. *Berlin*: 1926. 128 pp.

Loisch, Joh.—Rudolf Weber. Ein Zipser Volksdichter. Mit Webers schönsten Gedichten. [Zipser-Bücher. 3.] *Budapest*: L. Kókai, 1925. 126 pp. M. 2.50.

Lokotsch, Karl.—Etymologisches Wörterbuch der amerikanischen (indianischen) Wörter im Deutschen. [German. Bibl. IV. Reihe, 6 Bd.]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1926. 72 pp. M. 3.50.

Lüers, Grete.—Die Sprache der deutschen Mystik des Mittelalters im Werke der Mechthild von Magdeburg. Diss. Teil-druck. *München*: 1926. vii, 31 pp.

Maurus, P.—Die Wielandsage in Literatur u. Kunst. Weitere neuzeitl. Bearbeitungen. [T. 4]. *München*: Selbstverlag, 1926. II, 28 pp. M. 1.

Mayr, Otto.—Die Prosadichtung Franz Dingelstedts. Diss. *München*: 1926.

Mazzucchetti, Lavinia.—Il nuovo secolo della poesia tedesca. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1926. viii + 269 pp. L. 15. (Le grandi civiltà, no. 3.)

Midgley, H.—Translation from and into German. A Guide to German unseen translation and composition. *London*: J. M. Dent, 1926. 124 pp. 70 cts.

Milleker, Felix.—Lenau im Banat. [Banater Bücherei. 25]. *Wrschats*: J. E. Kirchners Wwe., 1926. 35 pp.

—Franz Xaver Kappus. Ein moderner deutscher Dichter aus dem Banat. [Banater Bücherei, 23.]. *Wrschats*: J. E. Kirchners Wwe., 1926. 15 pp.

Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik. Jahrbuch, 1925. *Milwaukee*: National Teachers' Seminary, 166 pp. \$1.00.

Müller, Karl (Fraureuth).—Unsere Kanzleisprache. *Dresden*: O. & R. Becker [1926]. 48 pp. 75 Pf.

Naumann, Louis.—Umschau unter den Flurnamen östlich der Saale. *Naumburg*: H. Sieling, 1925. 36 pp. 80 Pf.

Patzig, Herm.—Alte Ortsnamen im Westen Gross-Berlins. Ihr Ursprung u. ihre Bedeutung. *Berlin*: K. Curtius [1926]. 48 pp. M. 1.50.

Penzat, K.—Die Theophiluslegende in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters. [Germ. Studien, H. 43.]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1926. 263 pp. M. 10.

Pfaff, Emil.—Hermann Lingg als epischer Dichter. Diss. *Giessen*: 1925. 22 pp.

Pöhlmann, Tobias.—Goethes Naturauffassung in neutestamentlicher Beleuchtung dargestellt. *Berlin*: Furche-Verlag, 1927. 189 pp. M. 6.

Ponga, Hermann.—Das Bild in der Dichtung. 1. Bd. Versuch einer Morphologie der metaphorischen Formen. *Marburg*: N. G. Elwert, 1927. xx, 513 pp. M. 20.

Rabel, Gabriele.—Goethe und Kant. Bd. 1 u. 2. Abt. A. *Wien*: Selbstverlag, 1927. xv, 400; 100 pp. M. 12.50.

Rang, Bernh.—Die Kunst der Überschrift in der Lyrik. Diss.-Auszug. *Giessen*: 1925. 10 pp.

Reimann, Olga.—Das Märchen bei E. T. A. Hoffmann. Diss. *München*: 1926.

Riemann, Ernst.—Raupachs dramatische Werke ernster Gattung. Diss. *München*: 1926.

Rodenwald, H.—Goethe in Trarbach und sein Besuch bei Ludwig Böcking. *Trarbach-Trarbach*: G. Balmer, 1926. 56 pp. M. 1.

Sachsse, Dorothea K.—Modern Exercises in German. *New York*: Globe Book Co. [1926]. 57 pp.

Schäfer, Rob.—Der Ausdruck der Empfindungen im Parzival Wolframs von Eschenbach. Diss.-Auszug. *Giessen*: 1925. 12 pp.

Scheffel, J. V. v.—Vom jungen Scheffel. Briefe an s. Studienfreund Rud. Köhler. Mit e. Einf. von Th. Hampe. *Weimar*: Literar. Inst. 1926. M. 7.50.

Scheiwiller, Otmar.—Annette von Droste-Hülshoff in der Schweiz. *Einsiedeln*: Benziger & Co. [1926]. 272 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Scherer, Wilh.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. 16. Aufl. (Nachw. v. Ed. Schröder). *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1927. xii, 843 pp. Cloth, M. 12.

Schlageter, Emil.—Reimwörterbuch zu Gottfrieds Tristan. [Münchener Texte. Erg.-Reihe, H. 61]. *München*: Callwey, 1926. 138 pp. M. 10.

Schmeer, H.—Der Begriff der "schönen Seele" besonders bei Wieland u. in d. deu. Lit. d. 18 Jh. [Germ. Studien, H. 44]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1926. iv, 80 pp. M. 3.20.

Schmid, Eduard E.—Hebbel und Kleist. 2 Kapitel zur Frage des Einflusses. *München*: J. B. Hohenester, 1926. 57 pp. M. 2.50.

Schröter, Ernst.—Walahfrids deutsche Glossierung zu den biblischen Büchern Genesis bis Regum II und der ahd. Tatian. [Hermaea, XVI.]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. xi, 204 pp. M. 12.

Schwickert, Anton.—Die Reimkunst des frühmhd. Gedichtes: Vom himml. Jerusalem, vergl. m. d. übrigen Gedichten des österr. Sprachgebietes von ca. 1130-1160. Diss. *Köln*: 1926. 90 pp.

Schwemann, R.—Dunkle Stellen aus Goethes Faust in neuer Auffassung. 3. Aufl. *Münster i. W.*: F. Copenrath, 1926. 78 pp. M. 2.

Sommer, Paul.—Erläuterungen zu Gottfried Kellers "Martin Salander";—zu Gerhart Hauptmanns "Der Biberpelz";—zu Gerhart Hauptmanns "Die Weber";—zu Gerhart Hauptmanns "Die versunkene Glocke." [Königs Erläuterungen zu den

Klassikern, Bdch. 187-190]. *Leipzig*: H. Beyer [1926]. 60 Pf. each.

Spiero, Heinr.—Die Heilandsgestalt in der neueren deutschen Dichtung. *Berlin*: Eckart-Verl. [1926]. 336 pp., Cloth, M. 6.

Springer, Brunold.—Der Schlüssel zu Goethes Liebesleben. Ein Versuch. *Berlin-Nikolassee*: Verl. d. Neuen Generation [1926]. 87 pp. M. 3.

Todt, A. W.—Die Behandlung des Räumlichen bei Tieck. Diss.-Auszug. *Giessen*: 1924. 13 pp.

Truckenbrodt, R.—Zur westergelbigen Volkskunde. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Mundart. Diss. *Halle*: 1926. 128 pp.

Wälchli, Gottfried.—Schillers Wallenstein. Innere Entstehung u. innere Form. Diss. *Zürich*: 1925. 139 pp.

Weber, Ernst.—Des deutschen Spielmanns Werden und Wirken. *München*: Callwey, 1926. 123 pp. M. 2.50.

Wechlin, H. E.—Aargau als Vermittler deutscher Lit. an die Schweiz. 1798-1848. Diss. *Fribourg*: 1925. iv, viii, 167 pp.

Werner, Max.—Studien zu J. P. Hebel's "Alemannischen Gedichten." Diss. *München*: 1926.

Zeydel, Edwin H.—Early References to Storm and Stress in German Literature. [Indiana Univ. Studies, Vol. XIII, no. 71]. *Bloomington, Ind.*: Univ. Bookstore, 1926. 41 pp. 50 cts.

Zweig, Stefan.—Erinnerungen an Emile Verhaeren. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag, 1927. 90 pp. M. 12.

FRENCH

Anderson, F.—Illustrations of early Fr. lit. *Boston*: Ginn, 1926. xiii + 127 pp.

Audiat, P.—La biographie de l'œuvre litt., esquisse d'une méthode critique. Diss. *Paris*: Champion, 1924. 277 pp.

Baudelaire.—Œuvres complètes, éd. J. Crépet. *Paris*: Conard, 1926. vii + 363 pp. Fr. 30.

Belis, A.—La critique fr. à la fin du XIXe s. (Brunetière, Faguet, Lemaître, France). *Paris*: Gamber, 1926. xii + 267 pp.

Bonneau, G.—A. Samain. Diss. *Paris*: d'Arthez, 1925. 216 pp.

—A. Samain, essai de bibliographie. Diss. *Paris*: d'Arthez, 1925. 36 pp.

Bopp, L.—Amiel, essai sur sa pensée et son caractère. Diss. *Paris*: Alcan, 1925. xix + 375 pp.

—Principes généraux de pédagogie d'Amiel. Diss. *Paris*: Alcan, 1925. 135 pp.

Carré, J. M.—Michelet et son temps. *Paris*: Perrin, 1926. Fr. 12.

Coppin, J.—Etude sur la grammaire et le vocab. de Montaigne. Diss. *Lille*: Morel, 1925. 112 pp.

Cornilleau, R.—H. de Balzac. *Paris*: Spes, 1927. 222 pp. Fr. 6.75.

Credali, A.—L'œuvre d'Eckmann-Chatian. *Parma*: Tip. Donati, 1925. 25 pp. L. 2.

Deléry and Renshaw.—S'instruire en s'amusant. *Boston*: Allyn & Bacon, 1926. 80 cts.

Ditchy, J. K.—Le thème de la mer chez les Parnassiens, Leconte de Lisle et Hérédia. *Paris*: les Belles-Lettres, 1927. 119 pp.

Doillet, L.—Papassier s'en va-t-en guerre, ed. Kerr and Sonet. *Boston*: Ginn, 1927. xi + 191 pp.

Frierson, W. C.—L'influence du naturalisme fr. sur les romanciers anglais de 1885 à 1900. Diss. *Paris*: Giard, 1925. 293 pp.

Gaquère, l'Abbé F.—La vie et les œuvres de Claude Fleury (1640-1723). Diss. *Paris*: de Gigord, 1925. v + 515 pp.

—Dialogues sur l'éloquence judiciaire de C. Fleury. Diss. *Paris*: de Gigord, 1925. 142 pp.

Grimm, C.—Seize petits contes tout modernes. *Boston*: Ginn, 1927. v + 203 pp.

Hills, E. C. and Dondo, M.—Contes dramatiques. *Boston*: Heath, 1927. viii + 206 pp. \$1.

Holmes, U. T.—A Fr. Composition, rev. ed. *Columbia, Mo.*: Lucas, 1926. vi + 134 pp.

Lasserre, P.—Le Secret d'Abélard. *Paris*: Michel, 1926. 256 pp. Fr. 12.

Lawton, H. W.—Térence en France au XVIIe s. Diss. *Paris*: Jouve, 1926. 570 pp.

Léautaud, P.—Le Théâtre de Maurice Boissard (1907-23). *Paris*: Nouv. rev. fr., 1926. 272 pp. Fr. 12.60.

Lebel, A. R.—L'Afrique occidentale dans la litt. fr. Diss. *Paris*: Larose, 1925. 279 pp.

Le Gresley, O.—L'enseignement du fr. en Acadie (1604-1926). *Paris* diss. *Mamers*: Enault, 1925. 257 pp.

Luppé, A. de.—Les jeunes filles dans l'aristocratie et la bourgeoisie à la fin du XVIIIe s. Diss. *Paris*: Champion, 1924. viii + 256 pp.

Magendie, M.—La Politesse mondaine et les théories de l'honnêteté en France de 1600 à 1660. Diss. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1925. xl + 936 pp.

— L'Honneste homme par N. Faret. Diss. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1925. lli + 120 pp.

Maupassant.—Cinq contes, ed. J. B. Paterson. *New York*: Oxford, 1926. 96 pp. 45 cts.

Muenier, P.-A.—E. Montégut. Diss. *Paris*: Garnier, 1925. xxiii + 385 pp.

— Bibliographie des œuvres d'E. Montégut. Diss. *Paris*: Garnier, 1925. viii + 210 pp.

Nerval, G. de.—Notes d'un amateur de musique, ed. A. Cœuroy. *Paris*: Cahiers de Paris. 108 pp. Fr. 18.

Nozière.—Mme Dorval. *Paris*: Alcan, 1927. 131 pp. Fr. 15.

Oulié, Marthe.—Le cosmopolitisme du Prince de Ligne. Diss. *Paris*: Hachette, 1926. 255 pp.

Pailleron, Marie-Louise.—Sainte-Beuve à seize ans. Préf. de Lasserre. *Paris*: Le Divan, 1926. 96 pp. Fr. 9.

Paton, Lucy A.—Les Prophécies de Merlin. Part I. *New York*: Heath, 1926. xxxix + 496 pp. \$6. [M. L. A. monograph series I.]

Payen, L.—Anthologie des matinées poétiques de la Comédie-Fr. T. II. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1927. 410 pp. Fr. 13.

Raoul de Cambrai, trans. by Jessie Crossland. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1926. xiv + 178 pp. \$1.85.

Renan.—Sur Corneille, Racine et Bossuet, notes inédites. *Paris*: Cahiers de Paris, 1927. 108 pp. Fr. 18.

Roumiguère, H.—Le fr. dans les relations diplomatiques. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1926. 83 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Mod. Philology.)

Sand, A.—Le Berry de G. Sand. *Paris*: Morancé, 1926. 180 pp. Fr. 50.

Schwarz, H. S.—Contemp. Fr. stories of mystery and fantasy. *New York*: Knopf, 1926. \$1.50.

Sechehayé, A.—Essai sur la structure logique de la phrase. *Paris*: Champion, 1926. 240 pp. Fr. 36.

Valeri, D.—Montaigne. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1925. 61 pp. L. 5. (Profili, no. 80.)

Vasconcellos, I. de.—L'inspiration dantesque dans l'art romantique fr. Diss. *Paris*: Picart, 1925. 191 pp.

Verhaeren.—Les Débâcles avec une étude d'A. Fontaine. *Paris*: Mercure de Fr., 1926. 200 pp. Fr. 230.

Viollet, B.—Il romanzo femminile francese contemporaneo. *Milano*: Casa edit. "Alpes," 1925. 259 pp. L. 9.90.

Vinaver, E.—Etudes sur le Tristan en prose. Diss. *Paris*: Champion, 1925. 99 pp.

Voltaire.—Zadig, ed. H. W. Preston. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1926. xvi + 152 pp. 70 cts.

Wickersheimer, Edith.—Le Roman de Jehan de Paris. Diss. *Paris*: Champion, 1925. 93 pp.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Tragedie: Merope, Maria Stuarda, La congiura de' Pazzi, Don Garzia, Saul, Agide, Mirra, Bruto I, Bruto II. Nuova edizione illustrata, accuratamente corretta. *Milano*: Bietti e Reggiani, 1925. 503 pp.

— Vita scritta da esso, con introduzione e commento di D. Bianchi. Edizione integrale. *Palermo-Roma*: R. Sandron, 1925. xl + 434 pp. L. 18. (Collezione Sandron di classici italiani con note e commenti, no. 29.)

Alighieri, Dante.—Il Convivio, con prefazione di P. Papa. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1926. xviii + 181 pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca di letteratura, no. 8-10.)

Biondolillo, F.—Saggi e ricerche. La religiosità di T. Folengo; La religiosità di F. Petrarca; L'estetica di Goethe; Antonio Veneziano; Manoscritti ignoti di A. Veneziano. *Catania*: Studio edit. Moderno, 1926. 122 pp. L. 8. (Pagine di critica.)

Bonaventura, San.—Vita di S. Francesco, a cura di G. Battelli con illustrazioni di A. Razzolini. *Sancasciano-Pesa*: Soc. edit. Toscana, 1926. xvi + 254 pp. L. 15.

Bouvy, E.—A travers cinq siècles de littérature italienne. *Paris*: Leroux, 1926. 179 pp.

Carducci, Giosue.—Giambi ed epodi, commentati da D. Ferrari. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1926. viii + 224 pp. L. 15.

Cesari, Antonio.—Della fede e religione cristiana. Sermoni apologetici, inediti o sparsi, con note e proemio di G. Guidetti. Volume unico. *Reggio Emilia*: Collez. stor. letter., tip. edit. Guidetti, 1926. lxxvii + 494 pp. L. 12. (Opere minori di Antonio Cesari, vol. X.)

Cieco, Francesco.—Libro d'arme e d'amore, nomato Mambriano. Introduzione e note di G. Rua. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1926. 3 vols., xxviii + 271, 310, 312 pp. L. 36. (Classici italiani con note, seconda serie, n. 27-29.)

Cocchiara, G.—Le vastasate. Contributo alla storia del teatro popolare. *Palermo*: Sandron, 1926. 137 pp. L. 8.

Del Lungo, I.—Prolusione al Paradiso, letta in Roma, in Siena, in Orsanmichele,

in Londra. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 32 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

De Lollis, C.—Alessandro Manzoni e gli storici liberali francesi della Restaurazione. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1926. 191 pp. L. 13.50. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 134.)

Donati, A.—Ferdinando Martini. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggin, 1925. 63 pp. L. 2. (Medaglie.)

Ferri, E.—I delinquenti nell' arte; ed altre conferenze e saggi di scienza ed arte. Seconda edizione completamente rifatta. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1926. xix + 387 pp. L. 35.

Francesco, San.—I Fioretti di —, con introduzione di Fausta Casolini; prefazione del p. Vittorino Facchinetti. Illustrazioni di Giovanni Minguzzi. *Milano*: G. Agnelli, 1926. xxi + 368 pp.

Goldoni, Carlo.—La sposa sagace; commedia in cinque atti. La bottega del caffè; commedia in tre atti. I pettegolezzi delle donne; commedia in tre atti. *Milano*: A. Barion, 1926. 206 pp. L. 2.

Laignel, M. Th.—La littérature italienne. Préface par H. Hauvette. *Paris*: Armand Colin, 1926. 219 pp. (Collection Armand Colin. Section de langues et littératures, no. 83.)

Madaro, L.—Inventario dei manoscritti della biblioteca civica di Alessandria. *Alessandria*: Tip. Balocco e C., 1926. 68 pp.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—I promessi sposi. Storia milanese del secolo XVII. *Milano*: A. Barion, 1926. 479 pp. L. 4.

Misciattelli, P.—Monte de l'orazione. Preghiere antiche raccolte da —. *Siena*: Libr. edit. Senese, 1925. xix + 266 pp. L. 16.

Moschino, E.—Ombre imperiali. Discorsi e studi. *Aquila*: Casa edit. tip. Vecchioni, 1926. 214 pp. L. 12.

Natali, G.—Idee, costumi, uomini del Settecento. Studi e saggi letterari. Seconda edizione arricchita di nuovi saggi. *Torino*: Soc. tip. edit. Nazionale, 1926. 170 pp. L. 20.

Ondei, D.—Prose. Prefazione di U. Da Como. *Milano*: A. Mondadori, 1925. xi + 534 pp. L. 15.

Oramo, P.—I moderni: medaglie. Vol. V. Belli, Pecchio, Tommaseo, Renan, Prati, Pascoli, Satta. *Milano*: Fratelli Treves, 1926. 206 pp. L. 11. (Biblioteca storica.)

Pellico, Silvio.—Dei doveri degli uomini. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1926. 128 pp.

Renzulli, M.—Dante nella letteratura inglese. *Firenze*: Società editrice "La Via," 1926. 160 pp. \$2.00.

Rivalta, C.—Giovanni Pascoli. Ricordi di scuola e di vita. *Faenza*: A. Montanari, 1925. 32 pp.

Rocca, L.—Il canto V del Purgatorio letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 46 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Ruzzante (1502-1542).—Oeuvres complètes, traduites pour la première fois de l'ancien dialecte padouan rustique, par A. Mortier. *Paris*: J. Peyronnet et Cie, 1926. 665 pp. Fr. 50. (Un dramaturge populaire de la Renaissance italienne, II.)

Salimbene, Frate.—La bizzarra cronaca. Traduzione di F. Bernini. *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1926. xxiv + 182 pp. L. 4. (Scrittori italiani et stranieri: autobiografie e memorie, no. 244.)

Salvestrini, V.—Bibliografia delle opere di Giordano Bruno e degli scritti ad esso attinenti. Prefazione di Giovanni Gentile. *Pisa*: A. Salvestrini, 1926. xiv + 382 pp. L. 71, 70.

Sarno, A.—Scritti di filosofia del linguaggio. *Napoli*: Acquarulo e Iaccarino, 1926. 26 pp.

Segato, D.—Brani letterari e pagine sparse. *Pistoia*: Arte della Stampa, 1926. 106 pp.

Starkie, W.—Luigi Pirandello. *New York*: Dutton, 1926. 276 pp. \$3.00.

Valentin, A.—G. Pascoli, poète lyrique (1855-1912). *Grenoble*: Allier, 1925. xix + 546 pp. (Diss.)

—G. Pascoli, poèmes conviviaux, traduits et annotés. *Grenoble*: Allier, 1925. xiv + 162 pp. (Diss.)

Vigo-Fazio, L.—Saggi e discorsi. *Carpi*: Edizioni di "Bottega d'arte," 1926. 352 pp. L. 12. (Opere di pensiero di bottega d'arte.)

Zaccagnini, G.—La vita dei maestri e degli scolari nello Studio di Bologna nei secoli XIII e XIV. *Genève*: L. S. Olshki, 1926. 239 pp. Fr. 20. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum romanicum." Serie I: Storia, letteratura, paleografia, vol. 5.)

SPANISH

Album Bécquer.—Dibujos de Valeriano. Comentarios de Gustavo Adolfo. *Madrid*: Arte Hispánico, 1925. 52 hojas. 50 ptas.

Alcázar, B. del.—Poesías. *Madrid*: Ed. Voluntad, 1925. 91 pp. 1.75 ptas. (Letras españolas, II.)

Antología de cuentos mejicanos. Seleccion y pról. de B. Ortiz de Montellano. *Madrid*: Calleja, 1926. 289 pp. 3.50 ptas.

Barinaga, G.—Estudio crítico biográfico de E. Bobadilla. (Fray Candil). *Habana*: Carasa, 1926. 322 pp.

Barrera, C. A. de la.—El Cachetero del Buscapié. Prólogo de Rodríguez Marín. 2a ed. Santander: Tip. Martínez, [1926]. 282 pp. 4 ptas.

Blanco Fombona, R.—El conquistador español del siglo XVI. Ensayo de interpretación. 2a ed. Madrid: Mundo Latino, [1925]. x + 294 pp. 5 ptas.

Calderón.—Der wundertätige Magier. In neuer Übertragung von A. Potthoff. München: 1925. 163 pp.

—Die Andacht zum Kreuze. Übers. von A. W. von Schlegel. Leipzig: Ph. Reclam jun. 1925. 78 pp. (Reclams Universal Bibliothek, 999.)

Castillo, C. and Montgomery, C. M.—Advanced Spanish composition. Richmond: Johnson, 1926. \$1.40.

Croce, B.—España en la vida italiana durante el Renacimiento. Madrid: Mundo Latino, [1926]. 254 pp. 6 ptas.

Cruz, Sor Juana Inés de la.—Poesías escogidas de la décima musa mejicana. Barcelona: Bauzá, [1926]. 264 pp. 4 ptas.

Donoso, A.—La otra América. Gabriela Mistral, Arturo Cancela, Henríquez Ureña, Rafael Barret, Karez, Roshan, Eduardo Barrios, J. T. Medina, Totila, Albert. Madrid: Calpe, 1925. 270 pp. 4.50 ptas.

El Arte y la Literatura en Cuba.—Conferencias por S. Cuevas Zequeira, E. Valderrama, P. Cordero Leiva, y G. G. González. Tomo I. Habana: Sindicato Artes Gráficas, 1925. 103 pp.

Forner, J. P.—Oración apologética. Madrid: Pueyo, [1926]. 2.50 ptas. (Col. Telémaco de obras maestras y libros raros, III.)

Ganivet, A.—Hombres del Norte y El porvenir de España. Madrid: V. Suárez 1926. 124 pp. 3 ptas. (Obras completas, VIII.)

Hartzenbusch, J. E.—Cuentos y fábulas. Dos tomos. Madrid: Hernando, 1925 y 1926. 190 y 191 pp. (Biblioteca Universal, CLXXX y CLXXXI.)

López-Aydllo, E. y Palacios, J.—Lamas Carvajal. Estudio biográfico y crítico, con una selección de sus mejores composiciones. Madrid: Páez, 1925. 320 pp. 5 ptas. (Los grandes poetas gallegos.)

Mesanza, F. A.—El P. Diego de Hojeda y "La Cristiada." Caracas, Venezuela: 1925. 52 pp.

Ortega y Gasset, J.—La deshumanización del Arte. Ideas sobre la novela. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1925. 170 pp. 5 ptas.

Pérez Galdós, B.—Episodios Nacionales. Trafalgar. Hrsg. von H. Chmelicek. Bielefeld und Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing, 1925. xiv + 155 + 42 pp.

Quiñones de Benavente.—Entremeses. Madrid: Voluntad, 1925. 86 pp. 1.75 ptas. (Letras Españolas.)

Rojas, R.—Historia de la Literatura Argentina. Madrid: Ed. "La Facultad" 1925.

Ruano, J. M.—Resumen histórico-crítico de Literatura Colombiana. Bogotá: Ed. Santafé, 1925. 212 pp. Pesos 1.

Torres Ríoseco, A.—Precursores del modernismo. Casal, Gutiérrez Nájera, Martí, Silva. Madrid: Calpe, 1925. 128 pp. 4 ptas.

Velasco, R. F. de.—Referencias y transcripciones para la Historia de la Literatura Política en España. Madrid: Ed. Reus, 1925. 199 pp. 7 ptas.

Villa-Urrutia, Marqués de.—Centenario del nacimiento de Valera. Don Juan Valera diplomático y hombre de mundo. Madrid: F. Beltrán, 1925. 15 pp. 2 ptas.

CATALAN

Capdevila, C.—Santiago Rusiñol. 2a ed. Barcelona: López-Estelrich, 1926. 54 pp. + 6 láms. 1.50 ptas. (Quaderns Blaus.)

Capdevila, J. M.—Com s'ha d'escriure una carta en català? Barcelona: Ed. Barcino, 1926. 64 pp. 1 pta.

—Poetes y critics. Barcelona: Edicions López-Estelrich, 1926. 291 pp. 4.50 ptas.

Estelrich, J.—Entre la vida y els llibres. Barcelona: Emporium, 1926. 344 pp. 5 ptas.

Fabra, P.—Diccionari Ortografia abreuja. Barcelona: Ed. Barcino, 1926. 64 pp. 1.50 pta.

—La conjugació dels verbs en català. Barcelona: Ed. Barcino, 1926. 64 pp. 1 pta.

Les cent millors poesies líriques de la Llengua Catalana. Tria de J. M. Capdevila. Barcelona: Ed. Barcino, 1925. 228 pp. 5 ptas. (Els nostres classics.)

Martínez Tomás, A.—Raimundo Lulio. Barcelona: Araluce, 1925. 136 pp. + 6 láms. 3 ptas.

Martorell, J. i Galba, M. J.—Tirant lo Blanc. Vol. II. Tria del text, introducció, notes i glossari per J. M. Capdevila. Barcelona: Ed. Barcino, 1925. 312 pp. 7.50 ptas. (Els Nostres Classics, IV y V.)

Montoliu, M. de.—Breviari crític. Barcelona: Emporium, 1926. 329 pp. 4.50 ptas.

Selecta de contistes catalans.—Tres vols. Barcelona: S. Babra, 1926. 1.25 ptas. each vol. 111, 117 y 101 pp.

Verdaguer, J.—Barcelona: Ed. Cervantes, 1926. 78 pp. 5 ptas. (Las mejores poesías (líricas) de los mejores poetas.)